

## FASTING IN THE EARLY CHURCH

WO articles which appeared in these pages in June and July of last year, and which were issued as a pamphlet under the title of "The Eucharistic Fast,"<sup>1</sup> have given rise to a correspondence lasting for nearly four months in *The Guardian* newspaper, and also to an acrimonious rejoinder, ostensibly a review, in *The Modern Churchman* for December.<sup>2</sup> As a revelation of the spirit which pervades a notable section of the Established Church, a section which is identified neither with the extreme Evangelicals on the one hand nor with the extreme Anglo-Catholics on the other, it is interesting to find the reviewer in the Modernist organ delivering himself as follows:

The shallow statement drawn up by the Anglican bishops, after the first rejection of the Deposited Book, that fasting communion is "an ancient and laudable" custom, seems to have given Roman Catholics just the support they needed in these trying times, when the position of the Agape before the Eucharist in the apostolic age is universally acknowledged.<sup>3</sup>

It would almost seem as if the really up-to-date Anglican has no more use for the bishops of the Establishment than he has for the Pope of Rome. Incidentally the statement that "the position of the Agape before the Eucharist in the apostolic age is universally acknowledged" is by no means borne out by a book which has recently been published, seemingly with the blessing of no less an authority than Adolf Harnack, and which denies that the Agape had any connection at all with the primitive Eucharist.<sup>4</sup> This is only a specimen of many similar lapses which prove that the limitations of

<sup>1</sup> "The Eucharistic Fast; some Comments on a recent publication of the Rev. Percy Dearmer." Longmans. Price, 1s.

<sup>2</sup> It is noteworthy that while the reviews in *The Modern Churchman* are almost invariably initialled and are very brief, this notice of a short pamphlet extends to five pages and is anonymous. The acting editor (Dr. Major being absent) gives as one reason for declining to admit any correspondence on the subject that he does not know who the writer was. I venture to think that Dr. Dearmer would be able to tell him.

<sup>3</sup> *The Modern Churchman*, Dec. 1928, p. 563.

<sup>4</sup> "Mysterium und Agape, die gemeinsamen Mahlzeiten in der alten Kirche"; von Karl Völker, Gotha, 1927.

the anonymous reviewer are quite curiously identical with those of the author of "The Truth about Fasting." It is not however, the purpose of the present article to amplify what has already been said here about the fast before Communion. As the title just quoted sufficiently indicates, the scope of Dr. Dearmer's book was not limited to the fast which preceded the reception of the Holy Eucharist. He set out to throw light upon the whole question of penitential fasting in the Christian Church. In his view it was a survival of Pharisaic formalism. Our Lord's intention, he argues, had been to abolish all such formalism. The external practices of fasting and Sabbath observance were identified with the Old Testament dispensation. The new wine of Christ's teaching required new bottles. "Jesus led His hearers away from all ceremonial observances to moral categories—'Not from without inwards, but from within outwards'." Discussing the incident recorded in Mark ii. 18-20, and in the synoptic parallels, Dr. Dearmer denies that our Lord's words imply any commendation of fasting as a practice for those who were to embrace the Christian faith. Familiar though it be, it may perhaps be well to quote the passage as we read it in the Revised Version:

And John's disciples and the Pharisees were fasting: and they come and say unto Him, Why do John's disciples and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but Thy disciples fast not? And Jesus said unto them, Can the sons of the bride-chamber fast while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast. But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and then will they fast in that day.

Our Lord's answer, Dr. Dearmer declares, "is that of a poet. He makes of fasting a token of sorrow, and says His disciples cannot sorrow now, but that they will have sad enough occasion on that day when He is taken from them." It was, we are further told in a footnote, a misunderstanding of these words "which led succeeding ages to think that He had encouraged fasting."<sup>1</sup> By this mention of "succeeding ages" Dr. Dearmer obviously means to suggest that there was some notable lapse of time before any such literal interpretation of our Lord's meaning obtained currency. But

<sup>1</sup> "The Truth about Fasting," p. 16.

why should our Lord speak in poetical metaphors, and what is the evidence or authority for supposing that the practice of fasting in the Christian Church does not date from the apostolic age? Dr. Dearmer is here, as in many other cases, in flat contradiction with the modern scholarship to which he is so fond of appealing. There is at the present day no more distinguished representative of patristic learning than the Oxford (Dean Ireland's) Professor of Scriptural Exegesis. In the "New Commentary on Holy Scripture," which is of even more recent date than Dr. Dearmer's own booklet, Dr. C. H. Turner remarks concerning the very passage (Mark ii. 20) now under discussion:

It is more than likely that the *Pascha*, that is the annual commemoration of the Resurrection with a fast immediately preceding it, was, when Mark wrote, already in regular use in the Christian communities. Tertullian definitely connects the Paschal fast with the Gospel, saying "those days they held to be marked out for fasts 'in which the bridegroom was taken away'." Probably the earliest custom of this fast confined it to a single day preceding the Easter festival and this would account for the singular in Mark.<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Turner, then, thinks it probable that at least one definite fast was observed of rule by Christians even in the Apostolic age before St. Mark wrote his gospel. But what date are we to assign for this? The passage in which the Oxford professor formulates his conclusions has so much which is of interest to Catholics that in spite of the digression I venture on a rather lengthy quotation:

Early testimony is divided on the issue whether it was in St. Peter's lifetime or after his death that the Gospel was written. But it is more natural to think that it was exactly the loss of Peter's oral teaching which prompted the Roman Christians to demand, and Mark to provide, the nearest possible substitute, a written record which should in some measure reproduce what the Apostle had taught by word of mouth. The *terminus a quo* of the Gospel will therefore be the death of Peter, and that can be established within very narrow limits. That both

<sup>1</sup> "A New Commentary on Holy Scripture," Edd. Gore and Goudge (S.P.C.K.), N.T., p. 58. Although the Vulgate reads "in illis diebus," the best Greek texts give the singular *& tkeisiv tñ &μερα*.

St. Peter and St. Paul suffered martyrdom at Rome in the persecution which broke out in A.D. 64 . . . is plain matter of historical fact, and would never have been doubted if it had not been for the controversial desire to throw discredit either on Christian origins in general or on those of the Roman Church in particular. Against the quite unconvincing attack of Professor E. T. Merrill of Chicago ("Essays in Early Christian History," 1924, pp. 267—332<sup>1</sup>) may be set the judgment of the greatest living authority in Germany on ancient history, Eduard Meyer ("Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums," III., 1923, pp. 498—500). Meyer does not write from a Christian point of view, and many things that he says we could not of course accept; but his book is of the highest importance and his argument always commands respect. "The mention of Mark in Paul," he writes, "contains an irrefragable testimony for the presence and martyrdom of Peter at Rome. Quite apart from that point, the tradition itself is as certain as can be, and rejection of it can only be explained as due to dogmatic prepossession" . . . That Peter was one of the victims in Nero's gardens on the Janiculum is probable from the fact that his body was buried on the Vatican hill, for that is near by to the Janiculum. If we place the date of his martyrdom in A.D. 64—65 we shall not be far wrong. . . . Between A.D. 65 and 70, and I should think nearer the earlier limit than the later, the first Life of Jesus Christ was written down in the record of the experiences of His chief disciple St. Peter by Peter's "interpreter" St. Mark.<sup>2</sup>

But to return to our more immediate subject, Dr. Dearmer's grounds for asserting that "Christ did everything that was needed to guard the Church against all fasting regulations" are of the most shadowy description. He notes that in Mark ix. 29 (28), "This kind can go out by nothing but by prayer and fasting," the oldest Greek manuscripts omit the words "and fasting." The Revisers have therefore rejected them as a later interpolation. Something similar has happened in Matt. xvii. 20(21), in Acts x. 30 and in I Cor. vii. 5; and this, Dr. Dearmer contends, "shows how easily men who were under the influence of Jewish habits read the idea into the

<sup>1</sup> On Prof. Merrill's book see THE MONTH, August 1925, pp. 119—129.  
<sup>2</sup> "New Commentary," N.T., pp. 44—45.

original records and thus made it appear to later ages that fasting was observed by Christ and taught by the Apostles."<sup>1</sup> That our Lord Himself fasted for forty days in the wilderness is not stated in the Marcan account (i. 13), and we are bidden to infer that when Matthew and Luke declare that He ate nothing they mean no more than that He endured the privations inevitably entailed by such solitude. The definite mention of fasting in Acts (xiii. 3), when Saul and Barnabas were "separated" for their special mission, and again in Acts (xiv. 22), when priests were ordained, cannot be got rid of by textual criticism; but Dr. Dearmer suggests that the word "fasting" may also have slipped in here "before the fourth and fifth centuries to which our earliest manuscripts belong." If St. Paul (II Cor. xi. 27) speaks of being "in fastings often," our Modernist critic will have it that he only means privations. But surely the mention of "in hunger and thirst" immediately preceding requires us to suppose that two distinct ideas were conveyed, and still more the coupling together (in II Cor. vi. 5) of "in watchings, in fastings" plainly implies that a voluntary form of self-discipline was in the Apostle's mind. If there were any recorded utterance of our Saviour's which condemned fasting, as He condemned the extravagance of Sabbath observance, there would be more excuse for Dr. Dearmer's violent repudiation of Christian tradition, but the two things we do clearly know are that He lavished eulogies upon St. John the Baptist whose "meat was locusts and wild honey" and whose disciples undeniably were encouraged to fast, and secondly that He rebuked, not fasting itself, but ostentation in fasting. "But thou," He said, "*when thou fastest* anoint thy head and wash thy face, etc." The preposterous line of argument followed in the book here criticized would justify us in rejecting not merely fasting but all public worship as contrary to primitive Christian tradition, on the ground that our Lord said, "when thou shalt pray, enter into thy chamber, and having shut the door, pray to thy Father in secret."

It may be readily granted that the discipline of fasting in the early Church, like that of the Eucharist and of penance, grew up by a slow and gradual process of development. No scholar now maintains that a Lent of forty days was instituted by the Apostles. St. Irenaeus, about A.D. 196, appears to be the earliest authority to tell us of a definite paschal fast,

<sup>1</sup> "The Truth about Fasting," p. 25.

and he at the same time implies that there was great diversity of practice. Nevertheless he describes the custom as being already of ancient date and that these differences had existed for a long time. "Some," he says, "think they ought to fast one day; others two; others more than two; others reckon together forty hours both of the day and the night as the day of fasting."<sup>1</sup> Later information which we derive from St. Dionysius of Alexandria, the "Festal Letters" of St. Athanasius, the pilgrim lady *Ætheria*, and the Church historian Socrates, makes it clear that even down to the fifth century there was no sort of uniformity of usage regarding the duration of the fasts or the nature of the food permitted in different parts of the Christian world. The one feature common to all fasts was that no food was allowed to pass the lips until a late hour. Fasting essentially meant going without nourishment, though the time at which it might lawfully be broken varied according to the nature of the fast and the usage of the particular locality. But this is a point upon which we shall have to speak further later on.

While, however, positive evidence of any general fast of precept does not occur before the close of the second century, there cannot be reasonable doubt that as a practice of devotion it existed in the Christian Church from the beginning. Examples from the New Testament have already been cited, and we find references to it not rarely in the earliest sub-apostolic literature. The date of the "Didache" is still matter of controversy, but it can hardly be later than about A.D. 120. In two passages there is a noteworthy mention of fasting:

But before the baptism let him that baptizeth and him that is baptized fast, and any others also who are able; and thou shalt order him that is baptized to fast a day or two before (ch. 7). . . .

And let not your fastings be with hypocrites [the writer here clearly indicates the Jews] for they fast on the second and fifth day of the week; but do ye keep your fast on the fourth and on the parastas [i.e., on the Wednesday and the Friday] (ch. 8).

The "Shepherd" of Hermas again is an early Christian document which down to the end of the fourth century was

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Eusebius, "Hist. Eccl." v. 24.

often treated as an inspired writing and copied in biblical manuscripts as forming part of the New Testament canon. Harnack thinks that one portion of it may be as old as A.D. 110; it was in any case completed about the year 140. In this little book references to fasting are frequent, and in its Greek text we even find the Latin word "statio" as the technical designation of a particular form of the practice. Without concerning ourselves with the copious allusions that may be found in Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and other writers of the third century, I will cite only a phrase in the homily which was formerly known as the second epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians. It is certainly not the work of Pope St. Clement, but scholars are pretty well agreed in assigning it to a date about thirty years after his time—say A.D. 130. Anyway the writer lays down the principle (ch. xvi.) that for a man who seeks to repent of his sins, "fasting is better than prayer," though almsgiving, he adds, is better than either. What stronger evidence could we desire to prove that within a hundred years of the Ascension the Church already recognized what we learn from the penny catechism nowadays, that fasting, prayer and almsdeeds are "the three eminent good works" of the Christian dispensation?

If, as Dr. Dearmer contends, "the struggle against ceremonial rules," such as that of fasting, "was a central part of the life of Jesus," it is curious that before a century had elapsed His teaching should have been so completely forgotten. Our Anglican Modernist in another passage throws out the suggestion that when (in Acts xiii. 2—3 and xiv. 22) we find fasting mentioned in connection with the names of Paul and Barnabas, this was due to the fact that they "had not had personal intercourse with Jesus."<sup>1</sup> The point is worth noting as another striking example of the logical inconsistencies which, as I have shown in my previous articles, abound in Dr. Dearmer's tractate. No Apostle had had more intimate personal intercourse with his Divine Master than St. Peter, and yet it was Peter who even after the day of Pentecost was inclined to stand out for the old Jewish ritual observances. In his vision at Joppe he protested: "Not so, Lord, for nothing common or unclean hath ever entered into my mouth."<sup>2</sup> It needed a triple repetition of the vision to convince him that these particular observances were not to be

<sup>1</sup> "The Truth about Fasting," p. 26.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xi. 8, and cf. Galatians ii. 3—14.

retained. I venture to think that while our Saviour had denounced unsparingly the hypocrisies and excessive formalism of the Pharisees He had always upheld by precept and example the prescriptions of clearly understood ceremonial law. He had come to reform, but not to abolish it. Does Dr. Dearmer, I wonder, regard Baptism as a vain observance, and would he be prepared to admit all and sundry to the Communion Table quite irrespective of any compliance with the formality of previous Baptism and Confirmation? One does not see any reason why his anti-ceremonialism should stop short at this.

I have said above that amid many diversities of usage one constant element may be recognized wherever fasting was practised in the early Church. It was then held that to eat or drink in however small a quantity broke the fast. In subsequent ages many mitigations were gradually introduced. To drink water or even beer and wine, so long as the liquid was not regarded as nourishing, like milk for example, has been ruled not to be inconsistent with keeping the Church's law. Further, as the canonical hour of none came by degrees to be anticipated and the one permitted meal was consequently taken at midday or even somewhat before midday, a slight evening collation was considered lawful. Finally, those who quenched their thirst in the morning, availing themselves of the mediaeval axiom that to drink without eating was prejudicial to health, claimed that since they were free to drink, a few morsels of bread *ne potus noceat* might also be taken, and the claim was allowed. All this has come about in the West since Carolingian times, and the fast has been rendered easy in accord with the prevalent belief that men's constitutions have grown gradually enfeebled since the heroic days when the faithful worshipped in the Catacombs and faced martyrdom, as it was thought, in thousands. But during the first six hundred years of the Christian era no evidence, to my knowledge, is forthcoming of any relaxation of the primitive oriental conception that fasting meant literally an abstention from all food and drink. Islam understands it so to the present day. The Jews, in and before the time of Christ, understood it so, and for the first Christians, who were predominantly Jews, fasting must beyond question have signified what it signified for their unconverted fellow citizens.

It would seem almost superfluous to quote authorities were it not for Dr. Dearmer's perverse misinterpretations of all data which conflict with his thesis. Let me note then that in almost the first sentence of Hans Achelis's article in the "Real-Encyclopädie" that scholar declares that "the Christian fast developed in close dependence upon Jewish custom"; and indeed it needs little reflection to see that it could hardly have been otherwise. The early converts were practically all Jews, and they had probably been more than ordinarily scrupulous in the conscientious observance of those usages which belonged to the religious traditions of their race. Now the "Encyclopædia Biblica," which will not be suspected of any Romanizing tendencies, states plainly: "Fasting (*tsum*) to the Hebrews meant, as among other Orientals it still means, total abstinence from meat and drink. Such abstinence lasted as a rule from sunrise to sunset, when it ended in a meal."<sup>1</sup> There was, however, one divinely-ordained public fast, that of the Day of Atonement (*Yôm Kippûr*), and on this occasion a strict inedia was maintained from sunset unto sunset. Other fasts were partly voluntary, but public opinion seems to have enforced their observance by the majority.<sup>2</sup> The principle, in any case, was maintained that fasting meant going without food. A man who took a drink because he felt thirsty, or munched a cake to enable himself to hold out until mealtime, had broken his fast. It was part of the whole character of Oriental asceticism to be punctilious about such minutiae of external observance. When therefore Dr. Dearmer repeatedly affirms that fasting "did not carry with it the idea of no food or drink passing the lips, but meant not having a heavy meal during most of the day" (p. 34); or again, that "the penitential fasting of the patristic age meant no dinner" (p. 36); or once more, that "'fasting men' did not mean men who have not had any breakfast; it meant men who had not dined" (p. 73), etc., the burden of proof rests with him. But no scrap of evidence is offered in support of this statement. It is practically a gratuitous assertion. Let us admit that the idea did not originate with Dr. Dearmer. He borrowed it—as he has borrowed other things to an extent which no one would readily believe who has not investigated the matter—from Bishop

<sup>1</sup> "Encyclopædia Biblica," II., 1506.

<sup>2</sup> Schürer, "Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes," II., 411 seq. Esterly, "The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," pp. 410-435; Edersheim, "The Temple," pp. 296-299.

Kingdon's "Fasting Communion."<sup>1</sup> The solitary pretence of proof, which again Bishop Kingdon has supplied, is afforded by a casual utterance of St. Isidore of Seville, a writer of the seventh century. This comes very late as witnessing to patristic usage, but the date is immaterial, for the passage proves nothing. Echoing Bishop Kingdon, Dr. Dearmer writes:

The historic and proper meaning of the word "fast," *jejunium*, is abstemiousness. "Jejunium," says St. Isidore, "est parsimonia victus abstinentiae ciborum," and the idea of the word bearing another meaning, that of no food having passed the lips since the previous midnight, only grew up in the Middle Ages.<sup>2</sup>

But St. Isidore is not here concerned with things in themselves but only with words. He is discussing *etymologies*, as the title of his book shows, and he fantastically derives *jejunium* from *jejunum*, a thin gut, obviously putting the cart before the horse. There is not the least thought in this place of giving a definition of what was meant by ecclesiastical fasting. On the other hand St. Isidore says of the light morning refection known as "jentaculum" or "jantaculum," that it was so called because "it breaks the fast" (*solvit jejunium*). Clearly, then, Isidore did not agree with Dr. Dearmer in thinking that the fast was only broken by a full meal.

It is constantly assumed, and notably by the writer to whom I am here replying, that because certain practices or rules are not mentioned or but rarely referred to in the decrees of councils or the relatively scanty literature of the patristic period, there was therefore nothing determined as of general observance. The inference is quite fallacious. The very reason that we hear little or nothing about them is precisely because, being part of the COMMON LAW, they are universally taken for granted. In discussing the sacrament of confirmation

<sup>1</sup> "Fasting Communion, historically investigated from the Canons and Fathers, and shown to be not binding in England." By Hollingworth Tully Kingdon. 2nd Edit., 1875, Longmans. Bishop Kingdon was the younger brother of Father George Renorden Kingdon, S.J., who after being received into the Catholic Church became a Jesuit and was for many years director of studies at Stonyhurst and later at Beaumont. As pupil, and afterwards for seven years as colleague on the teaching staff, the present writer has reason to remember Father George Kingdon with much gratitude.

<sup>2</sup> Dearmer, p. 34; Kingdon, pp. 135-136. The passage occurs in St. Isidore's "Etymologie," Migne, P.L., lxxxi. 258.

conferred after baptism, an opponent of St. Jerome argues that there are many practices observed traditionally throughout the Christian world which have acquired an authority equivalent to that of written law though no code can be cited which contains them; and he appeals among other illustrations of his point to the usage of plunging the head of the child or catechumen three times into the water at baptism. "There are many such practices," he concludes, "which have not been written down, but which the observance of reasonable men has adopted" (*multaque alia scripta non sunt quæ rationabilis sibi observatio vindicavit*).<sup>1</sup> The law of fasting Communion and the strict *asitia* enjoined in the penitential fasts were precisely of this nature, though allusions to them are by no means completely lacking. With regard to the latter usage which now more immediately concerns us it may be worth while to call attention to three or four definite instances.

In the early years of the third century Tertullian, while still orthodox, wrote his treatise "De Oratione." In this he states that many people felt that it would be wrong to communicate on a fast day because they considered that the fast would be broken by the reception of the Eucharist. At that date private Communion at home was still permitted, and the African rigorist, sympathizing with their scruples, recommended them to take the consecrated Host to their houses and to wait to consume it until the hour for the fast was over.<sup>2</sup> It would hardly be possible to produce stronger proof that the observance of the fast was considered to be incompatible with the consumption of even the smallest amount of food. No doubt it is conceivable that the portion of consecrated bread distributed to the faithful in Holy Communion was considerably larger than the wafer with which we are familiar now, but it cannot possibly have satisfied hunger as a meal, and this one example alone would suffice to expose the error of Dr. Dearmer's contention that a moderate breakfast did not break the fast.

Tertullian was a man of Latin speech living in Carthage, St. Pachomius was an Oriental who exercised an unrivalled influence among the ascetics of the Egyptian Thebaid a century later. There were in his time certain teachers who felt

<sup>1</sup> St. Jerome, "Dialogus contra Luciferianos," c. 8. Though this argument is put into the mouth of an objector, St. Jerome finds nothing to say against it in principle. Migne, P. L., xxiii. 464.

<sup>2</sup> Tertullian, "De Oratione," ch. 19 (Migne, P. L., I., 1181-1183).

the same scruple as those just referred to. They thought it wrong "to receive the Body of our Lord" in the morning hours, for fear that their fast would thereby be broken. Pachomius rightly held that such spiritual food did not break the fast. "We ought," he said, "to receive the Eucharist every time, without (otherwise) eating or drinking, for this is befitting the feast of the Messiah."<sup>1</sup>

A Syrian contemporary of St. Pachomius, the great teacher Aphraates, still more directly lays down that "men are said to be fasting as long as they abstain from food and drink, but if a man eats or drinks any little thing he has broken the fast."<sup>2</sup>

Still earlier and from quite another part of the Roman empire we find in the Acts of the Martyr St. Fructuosus a chance allusion to the fasting discipline which was then generally observed. Fructuosus was a Spaniard who suffered in A.D. 259. The record tells us that when he and his companions in martyrdom were offered a cup of spiced wine on their way to execution, Fructuosus refused it, saying, "The hour for breaking our fast is not yet come." As the chronicler goes on to explain, "the day was only in its fourth hour" (*i.e.*, about 10 a.m.). "On Wednesday they had solemnly held a fast in the prison. And now, on the Friday, he hastened, joyful and free from care, that he might break his fast with the Martyrs and Prophets in the paradise which the Lord has prepared for them that love Him."<sup>3</sup> As the Christian poet Prudentius in his "Peristephanon" phrases the reply of Fructuosus:

"Jejunamus," ait, "recuso potum  
Nondum nona diem resignat hora."

It was quite clearly understood that even the ordinary Friday "statio" did not permit of any meal being taken before the ninth hour, 3 p.m.

Furthermore, although we cannot for a moment suppose that the discipline of fasting grew stricter amid the lawless excesses of the Merovingian and Carolingian epoch, still we find Pope Nicholas I. in 866 declaring that even on Sundays, when no one was fasting, the Catholic tradition held it to be wrong to consume the least morsel of food before the

<sup>1</sup> Amélineau in "Annales du Musée Guimet," xvii. 395.

<sup>2</sup> Aphraates in "Patrologia Orientalis" (Edd. Graffin and Parisot), I., 1181—3.

<sup>3</sup> See E. Owen, "Acts of the Early Martyrs," (1927), p. 102.

principal Mass was concluded at the hour of Terce, that is to say about 9 or 10 in the morning.

For those who read at all attentively the accounts which have been left us by such writers as *Ætheria*, *Palladius*, and *Epiphanius*, no doubt remains possible that a strict fast of 18, 24, 36, or even 40 hours was held not to be beyond the powers of endurance of quite ordinary people. Everything points to the conclusion that, as among the Jews a twenty-four hours' fast was obligatory on the Day of Atonement, so from the very beginning of the Christian Church an entire day's fast, often further extended to 40 hours or even more, was practised at the Pasch—Good Friday and Easter Eve. This was the prototype of other fasts more or less voluntary at first, but gradually multiplying and crystallizing into observances imposed by tradition or precept. No doubt the remembrance of our Lord's words about the day, or days, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them, and also the desire to imitate in some sort His 40 days' fast in the wilderness, played a great part in this development. But in any case fasting for the early Christians meant an entire abstention from food, and it is very significant that in the Syrian "Didascalia" of the third century, it is directed that in Holy Week the faithful should fast the entire Friday and Saturday "tasting nothing whatever."<sup>1</sup> Is it rash to conclude, from what has been said above and from my previous articles, that almost any name would have suited Dr. Dearmer's booklet better than the pretentious title he has given it—"The *Truth* about Fasting"?

HERBERT THURSTON.

<sup>1</sup> Funk, "Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum," Vol. I., p. 288.

## PROTESTANT EMANCIPATION

*"The Truth shall make you free."*—St. John viii. 32.

**T**HE Catholic prisoner in penal times possessed more true liberty than the jailor. The chains upon the persecuted symbolized the spiritual bondage of the persecutor, inasmuch as legality did not represent morality, nor the jailor, justice.

Catholic Emancipation should therefore provide the Protestant, as well as the Catholic, with a theme for thanksgiving. As the Joint Pastoral Letter from the English and Welsh Archbishops and Bishops says: "The Act of Emancipation not only set free the Catholics of these islands, but it freed, too, the Protestant people who dwelt in them from a stigma of persecution which had dishonoured them too long."

For Catholics, the story of Emancipation is enshrined in memory and consecrated to hope, glorifying the past and pointing to the future. I have been reading various records of that painful story with mingled feelings. What a crooked track it was! How much shorter the journey might have been! How the road was trampled with unnecessary conflict! That many great barriers were thrown across it by ill-meaning and well-meaning men, may still be seen by their ruins.

The signing of the Emancipation Bill on April 13th, 1829, did, in a certain final sense, close the era of the Penal Code, though relief of one kind or another was given from time to time over a long period of years, which meant but a lengthening of the chain. That chain was always lengthened with reluctance owing to unescapable pressure of political circumstances. It was finally severed with almost hysterical reluctance by His Most Protestant Majesty, George IV. The Penal Code, for centuries, had hung like a sword of Damocles over every Catholic. It may be true to say that it was suspended for much of the later time by a cart-rope and not by a thread; still, there it was—always a threat, a menace and an insult. The time when it functioned in full seems as remote as the age of mastodons and mammoths, but it is not so long ago, and its spirit is not yet absolutely extinct. Even now, there are certain pens dipped in little vials of poison, for the writing of articles concerning the Church of our Fathers.

There is exquisite pathos in reading of those early days before the thorns had budded, or the darkness had been relieved by an over-arching heaven of light. To-day, light is shot back upon that immortal band who, keeping the Faith in suffering, prayed, waited and longed, for the vision of Emancipation which never came, or the voice of an Edmund Burke or a Daniel O'Connell to break the weary silence of their long vigil. But the grain of mustard seed was there, with its promise of spreading branches and birds of spring.

Parabolically, one would say that it is possible to think too much of Herod, and not enough of the Shepherds and Wise Men. We thank God for deliverance from those days; reflection will help us also to thank Him *for* them. The ground, believed to be dead, has brought forth an abundant harvest; the weary desert will lead, I believe, to the Promised Land—promised to Our Blessed Lady. Those heroic songs of love-loyalty in the night, were an earnest of our *Te Deum* to-day. *That* was the real victory—*before the battle*. The heart of the Church almost seemed to cease beating, yet it was but one of those many intervening pauses necessary to its life from the cradle. The light of faith was not eclipsed by the glare of painful facts. Surely our thanksgiving must be made for those who, in the valley of the shadow, beheld the chariots and horsemen of God. Those who were faithful lost much, but gained more; thus making the cloud itself to be the silver lining.

From material premises, men have often reached a pessimistic conclusion concerning the Church, forgetting that such premises have no pertinence in regard to a supernatural institution. In the light of current events, it is illuminating to note this in the dissertations of certain bygone Italian *literati*. It is significant that in this centenary year of Emancipation, no event in Europe, or perhaps in the world, is of such moment as the Lateran Treaty, and no triumph so far-reaching as the triumph of the Papal Flag. Italy was never more united than it is to-day; yet early in the sixteenth century, Machiavelli said to Italy: "Thou wilt never have unity, except by abolishing the Papacy." Again in 1850, we find Mazzini writing: "Catholicism is dead. . . To-day, Catholicism is extinct." Of the Pope, he writes: "No other roof now remains to him but the cupola of St. Peter; and one day or other, the banner of liberty, waving from the temple, shall drive him even from that asylum." Now it is such

sentiments which have passed away, and the ghost of them is not strong enough to haunt either Cardinal Gasparri or Signor Mussolini as they sign the epoch-making Pact.

In the early days of the nineteenth century, Sydney Smith attacked the Penal Code with biting satire and moral indignation; but it is quite clear that he would have laughed to scorn the idea that Catholicism would ever attain the strength it has to-day in this country. Yet, just as the Holy Father is in the Eternal City "as blood is in the heart of a man," so the Catholic Church in England is increasingly regarded as the only Church with either potency or permanence. As Chesterton remarks: "Europe has been turned upside down over and over again; and at the end of each of these revolutions the same religion has again been found on top."

Catholics in penal days were, as Cardinal Newman calls them, truly a "*gens lucifuga*," a people who effaced themselves and shunned the light, cut off from the world around them. The Church was robbed of its adornments, but not of its beauty; the light of faith was hidden, but it never quite faded away. The clouds could hide the sun, but not destroy it. Our rights were entombed with the martyrs, but in sure and certain hope of a glorious resurrection.

We shall not forget that the cup of persecution was drained to its last dregs before it was smashed to pieces; but those who suffered made possible untold blessing to us and to our beloved land. Our dream of angels ascending and descending a ladder of light, set up in England, is possible because others have slept upon a pillow of stone. Our life came out of their death, and our spiritual fortune out of their toil in making it. In the worst of the penal days they were left with nothing but a cross, but by this sign they conquered for us. Refusing the dole of Mammon, they made at least possible a Catholic England. Cardinal Newman has said that Bishop Milner was "the champion of God's Ark in an evil time"; but this was because, though his symbol was the shepherd's crook, his secret was the Saviour's Cross.

We remember also how much we owe to those noble priests of France who, rather than betray their faith, chose material ruin and banishment in the closing years of the eighteenth century. They carried nothing into exile save their Faith, but they more than repaid the hospitality of Protestant England, by helping to spread that ancient Faith where men knew it not. Their dream of the future was that of our own Catholic

ancestors; with them they trod out the shadows from this darkened land.

Surely Protestants, or a considerable number of them, can rejoice with us. We desire no cup of thanksgiving which we cannot pass on. The Catholic Church has preserved the Bible which it was supposed not to read, when Protestants were hacking it to pieces. Surely, the open doors of Catholic churches all over the land, with Holy Mass said every morning, must bring a blessing to the whole country. Catholic history is not, or need not be, a closed book for Protestants. Catholic prayers are being offered for them every day. Catholic propaganda provides thousands with an opportunity of realizing what is writ large in every ancient British institution—that our Faith was their fathers' and should be theirs. The statement of Rousseau, that "the Reformation was intolerant from its cradle, and its authors universally persecutors" is easy enough to prove, but there are multitudes of Protestants who do not know it, and I believe would wish it otherwise if they did. The proposals of Lord George Gordon would to-day be drowned in a riot of Homeric laughter. Someone will rightly say that this is largely owing to indifference, but that only proves a something wrong with the head and not with the heart. That indifference must be met, and only the Catholic can meet it. I believe that if the majority of Protestants would read the Penal Code they would be moved with indignation, as, indeed, some of them were. Solon, on being asked how wrong-doing can be avoided in a State, replied: "If those who are not wronged feel the same indignation at it as those who are." In this memorable year it is our business to see that they do, even though the Press uses the soft pedal. Also, they must know that there were more than ten plagues in this modern Egypt because the Children of God were kept in bondage, and that whatever Emancipation from those plagues may be theirs, is directly due to the historic events we celebrate this year.

We believe that Our Blessed Lord calls Protestantism to "come forth" from its grave to a life of true faith; but the stone of ignorance and prejudice must first be rolled away. Fear and prejudice, the children of ignorance, persecuted the Church in past days. So far as the misled common people were concerned, persecution was not directed against the Church as it gloriously and eternally is, but against what they supposed it to be. Saul the persecutor has often become

an Apostle when met upon the Damascus road by the revealing Truth. When by the grace of God his ignorance is dispelled and he is aware Whom he has been persecuting, he has arisen and gone into the city . . . enquiring for the Presbytery. It is a mistake to suppose that an enemy *always* uses poisoned arrows. Often with the best intention in the world he is fighting a nightmare of his own imagination. He will be quite relieved to learn on the best of all authorities that it *is* a nightmare.

I do not think that persecution is likely to come again in this country as regards the Catholic Faith, though there are signs of its possibility in regard to Catholic morals. As regards the former, what we have to contend with is indifference—the desire to cultivate a friendly feeling all round *at any price*. Such a tendency leads men, in a crisis, to range themselves with the big battalions. A bow of peace, fashioned out of the mists of indifference, may be pretty but it is not permanent.

We must not forget that the passing of the Penal Code has synchronized with the passing of the beliefs Protestants once held. They have been thrown away, one after the other, like arms by a retreating army. They have torn their own flag to pieces, and isolated units have claimed now one fragment and now another, as the standard of the entire army. The fragmentary material concomitants are there, but no one supposes that they are the outward and visible sign of any certain faith. A man is not a Catholic nowadays because he wears a Roman collar, any more than he is a Liberal because he carries a Gladstone bag. We have witnessed the passing of Protestantism, but Paganism wanders amidst the ruins, looking for available sites on which to build temples to Baal, Moloch, and Mammon. *For the love of God and humanity, we must build first.* Protestantism has been betrayed by the very principle upon which it based its existence, and it is now a conflict, to all intents and purposes, between the Church and Paganism for the souls of men.

Men were told at the Protestant Reformation that they would find the truth by turning their backs to what they did not know to be the light, and they have been groping in increasing darkness ever since. The Catholic Church is that light, against which the powers of darkness cannot prevail. It is not only something to search for: it is something to search *by*, inasmuch as it provides those well-tested First

Principles without which any quest is hopeless. I mean that a Catholic having certainty about the Christian Creed, can shed its light upon any of the baffling problems of to-day; his reason, emotion, and will can safely function within the God-given limits of his creed. Without such first principles one begins nowhere and ends in despair. Our country has witnessed the passing of Protestantism as it was understood at the Reformation. The danger is Paganism, without reason to guide, authority to direct, or love to sustain. I do not believe in the inevitability of its triumph. Such a quiescent belief is an attitude of despair. This land is Our Blessed Lady's Dowry, and she will not fail us. The history of prayer for England is a heart-moving story; many of the Saints prayed and believed that it would once again become a land of saints. In this connection, Catholic Emancipation does mean the possibility of Protestant Emancipation also; the liberty to see, to know, and by the grace of God to embrace, the religion which no persecution could destroy. Certain it is that our country will return to the sanctuary it has abandoned;—or its last state will be worse than its first.

By our hardly won privileges we are bound to consider those who have them not. Our hearts are full as we remember those privileges, but they can never be light whilst the greater part of our fellow-countrymen are outside the Church. It is ours to use, gladly, and to the full, the spiritual benefits of the Father's House, but our music and dancing awaits the prodigal's return.

A. J. FRANCIS STANTON.

## A MEDIÆVAL LIFE OF CHRIST

**A**MONG the numerous works which influenced our mediæval English mystics was the "Meditationes Vitæ Christi," for long attributed to the Franciscan saint and doctor, Bonaventura. That St. Bonaventura did influence our own writers is undeniable,<sup>1</sup> but that that influence came through the "Meditationes" has of recent years been denied, since, so modern critics aver, the "Meditationes" were not written by him, but by some later unknown Franciscan friar.<sup>2</sup> Into the question of the authorship of the "Meditationes" I do not propose to enter in this article. I shall have something to say of it elsewhere.

It was without doubt, because of their own inherent beauty and charm, because of the vivid narrative, the scenic effect produced in the imagination, that the "Meditationes" had the vogue they enjoyed in the Middle Ages. Unlike Peter Comestor's "Historia Scholastica" or Clement of Llantony's "Monatessaron," meant exclusively and directly for clerical study, these "Meditationes," originally written for the guidance and spiritual welfare of a Poor Clare,<sup>3</sup> were by their simplicity, their freshness and their continued interestingness, well adapted to the understanding and piety of a less educated laity. For this reason it became the most popular Life of Christ throughout Europe and was frequently translated into the vernacular. Strangely enough, it enjoyed a greater popularity in England than in any other country—that is, if we are to judge from the existing manuscripts. Out of the eighty or so known manuscripts, seventy are to be found in England alone, whilst the rest are scattered among the various libraries on the Continent. One explanation of this wonderful popularity may be sought in the great mystical revival of the fourteenth century. Rolle himself translated a part of the "Meditationes."<sup>4</sup> Through him it possibly influenced Hilton and in turn Juliana of Norwich. It was also used as the basis or model of many spiritual works

<sup>1</sup> Horstman. *Introd. to "Richard Rolle of Hampole."* London, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> Various names have been suggested, e.g., Joh<sup>nes</sup> de Caulibus, Card. Bonaventure of Padua, Joannes Gorus.

<sup>3</sup> The author writes "Sancta Clara, dulcissima et mater tua." Ed. Lugduni. 1619.

<sup>4</sup> Horstman. *Op. cit.* Vol. I., p. 198.

of the period.<sup>1</sup> But for another and perhaps more important explanation of its widespread popularity and diffusion we must perforce look elsewhere.

It was at this epoch that the proclaimed forerunner of the Protestant Reformation appeared on the scene,—John Wycliff.<sup>2</sup> And in order to disseminate his doctrines the more easily, he bethought himself to translate the Bible into English, the text of which he dealt with to suit his own purpose. We must not imagine, however, that Wycliff was the first to translate the Bible into the vernacular. Parts of it had been translated as far back as the Anglo-Saxon times, whilst complete versions were already known at this period. Of the Wycliff Bible, Sir Thomas More wrote:<sup>3</sup>

In this translation he purposely corrupted the holy text, maliciously planting in it such words as might in the reader's ears serve to prove such heresies as he "went about" to sow. These he not only set forth with his own translation of the Bible, but also with certain prologues and glosses he made upon it, and he so managed this matter, assigning probable and likely reasons suitable for lay and unlearned people, that he corrupted in his time many folk in this realm.

To arrest the flood of heresy, Archbishop Arundel did not attempt to launch forth and sanction a new orthodox translation of the Bible. He wisely sought for a Catholic exposition of the Gospel which would be more readily grasped by the mass of the people. Miss Margaret Deanesly tells us:<sup>4</sup>

There is indeed a piece of evidence that Arundel was in 1408 seriously considering the provision of some English book in which the faithful might study the Life of Christ, with due guidance from the doctors. He seems to have decided that an actual translation of the biblical text, however well accompanied by glosses, was impossible, because it afforded the heretics grounds for argument and for the appeal to isolated texts.

However this may be, Archbishop Arundel sanctioned a translation of that most popular Gospel Harmony of the

<sup>1</sup> "The Southern Passion." E.E.T.S., 169, p. lxxix.

<sup>2</sup> Wycliff, born c. 1320; died 31st Dec. 1384.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted from Gasquet's "Eve of the Reformation," ed. 1900, p. 209.

<sup>4</sup> "The Lollard Bible," p. 321. Camb. Univ. Press, 1920.

Middle Ages, the "Meditationes Vitæ Christi," as a work specially adapted to the needs of the faithful and more likely to accomplish the purpose he had in view. The translation which he authorized was one made by the Carthusian, Nicholas Love, Prior of Mount Grace at Ingleby in Yorkshire, and was subsequently known as the "Mirrour of the blessed lyf of Jesu Christ."

This English version became quickly known. So widespread was its publication, so important did it become in the eyes of the laity, that soon we find frequent mention of it, in wills and bequests. In sanctioning its publication Arundel writes,<sup>1</sup> "that it should be made public as Catholic to the edification of the faithful and the confutation of all false heretics and Lollards." This translation, though by no means the earliest, was however the first to cover in any adequate manner the whole ground of the original Latin "Meditationes." In making the translation, Love did not rigidly adhere to the original text, thus he omitted parts like that on the active and contemplative life which he thought would be of little interest or utility to the laity, whilst he amplified other points which were but lightly touched upon in the original. Love's translation however was not the first introduction of the "Meditationes" to English readers, as I have already remarked. There had previously existed various verse and prose translations of the book. Of these the most noteworthy were the "Meditacyns of the soper of our Lord Jhesu"<sup>2</sup> and the "Privity of the Passion" of Rolle.<sup>3</sup> Thus in approving Love's translation, Archbishop Arundel was not authorizing an unknown work, but only another translation of a work which had been revered and used for over a hundred years, as I propose to show elsewhere.

The author of the "Mirrour" had Arundel's purpose well in mind. Over and over again he refers to the Lollard errors. To take but a few examples. The loosing of Lazarus from the grave he compares to that of the "sinner dead and bounden by the grave clothes of sin" loosed by confession and absolution; whilst the scribe emphasizes the point in a marginal note:<sup>4</sup> "Nota de confessione et absolutione." Again in reference to the institution of the Eucharist at the Last Supper, Love writes:<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Nearly all manuscripts have this memorandum of Arundel's license in Latin.

<sup>2</sup> E.E.T.S., O.S., 60.

<sup>4</sup> MS. Brazenose Coll. ix., ch. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Horstman, op. cit.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. ix., ch. 39.

These terms I touch here so specially because of lewed [ignorant] Lollards that meddle them against the faith falsely.

Now he speaks again in reference to confession:<sup>1</sup>

But here perauntre summe men thynken, after the false opinioun of lollardes, that schrifte of mowthe is not nede-fulle, but that it suffiseth only in herte to be schryuen to God, as this forsaide womman was. . . .

A characteristic blow at the tenets of Lollardy is found too in the following passage:<sup>2</sup>

Here mote we ferthermore note specially to purpose that they are of Judas parte, that reprehenden almes dedes, offrynges and othere devociouns of the peple done to holy chirche, holdinge all suche giftes of devocioun but folie and scienge that it were more medefull and better to be geuen to pore men.

Such observations we may be sure did not escape the vigilance and anger of the Lollards, nor would they lose time to vent their wrath upon the work. There is in fact evidence to show that the Lollards resented its publication—destined as it was to deal a severe blow at their teaching and influence. Thus in one manuscript of which they possessed themselves, the text treating of the institution of the Eucharist has been crossed out, whilst a marginal note says, "Do not believe thys foleshnes."<sup>3</sup> Owing to a vigorous crusade that was carried on at the time of which we are speaking, against heretical literature, very few Lollard publications have reached us. There is one however, the "Lanterne of Light," published in 1915, by the Early English Text Society, which the editor believes to have been first written between the years 1409—1415. It is an exposition of the Lollard tenets. Very likely, if we are to take the date in view, this book was evoked because of the "Meditationes" translated by Love.

As for the general structure of the "Meditationes," with the exception of a few introductory details and a last chapter on the method to be employed in the meditations, the author passes in review the leading events of Christ's life, with intermittent exhortations to the reader to imitate them. In the Latin edition before me,<sup>4</sup> the work comprises a hundred chap-

<sup>1</sup> MS. Brazenose Coll. ix., ch. 22.  
<sup>2</sup> Trin. Coll. Camb., 367, f. 128.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* ix., ch. 36.  
<sup>4</sup> Lugduni. 1619.

ters, though in certain recensions the number is considerably abridged. The first forty chapters tell us of the events which took place from the Incarnation to the ministry of Martha and Mary. Then, however, comes a break in the narrative and we are given a lengthy treatise on the active and contemplative lives, as symbolized by Martha and Mary. This he carries on through fourteen chapters. In thought, style and expression these chapters differ from what has gone before, and this fact suggests to some critics that this treatise is an interpolation, whilst others have been led to consider the whole work as a compilation rather than an original homogeneous work.

The character of the work is one of commentated narrative, interrupted with emotional apostrophe. Not for a moment is the reader's interest allowed to flag. He is continually reminded to think of the events narrated or described, as though he were a spectator. Every now and again he is admonished: "Considera," "compatere," "animadverte." The work abounds in quotations from the writings of the Fathers, especially St. Bernard. Taken as a whole it is a work of fascinating interest, but of special beauty and charm are the chapters on the Nativity and Passion, where these events are described with a wealth of detail, hardly to be found elsewhere. They are calculated, as the author remarks, to soften the hardest hearts.

Space does not allow a more detailed examination of a work,—honoured and revered in days long since gone by, a work which stimulated and helped to foster mystical devotion in the past—which served to stem an outbreak of heresy, but which like an old toy, having served its purpose, was allowed to fall into oblivion until recent scholarly research once again called attention to its beauty. It deserves to be better known than it is. Perhaps some enterprising Catholic publisher<sup>1</sup> will one day reprint for popular use at least the portion which retails the story of the Passion. This was the section which most appealed to the devotion of our English forefathers, as is witnessed by the large number of manuscripts which give only this story and by the many adaptations of this portion into Middle English.

FATHER MARCELLUS, O.S.F.C.

<sup>1</sup> There are to the writer's knowledge three English translations, but all more or less defective because they have been adapted for the use of the members of the Church of England.

## DID BIGOTRY DEFEAT SMITH?

[If the result of the Presidential election in the States caused any disappointment to Catholics in this country, it was because the contest seemed to turn on the matter of religion and because the verdict was thought to show that many American citizens considered the Catholic religion incompatible with genuine citizenship. We ourselves did not think that the charge of bigotry could fairly be laid at their door, and, therefore, we are glad to print the subjoined article by a keen and experienced observer which so strongly confirms our conviction.—EDITOR.]

**D**ID religion defeat Smith? Was the fact of Smith's Catholicism an insurmountable obstacle in his race for the presidency? Or, in other words, were the religious bigots of the country the decisive factor?

A group of vocal bigots are willing to accept the rôle. They proudly admit that it was their little arrow which killed Cock Robin, and they are doing everything they can to impress the politicians so that in the future no Catholic will be so much as nominated. But the bigots are not alone in their estimate of what actually decided the election. A great many liberal-minded Protestants, who opposed bigotry manfully during the campaign, sorrowfully admit that their efforts were in vain, and that as bigotry influenced so many voters it may be said to have been the really decisive factor.

And somewhat naturally, I suppose, a number of Catholics emphasize the amount of bigotry displayed during the campaign, the enormous quantities of vile literature distributed. These Catholics think that if Smith had not been a Catholic he would surely have been elected. Consequently, they look upon his defeat as a slap at themselves, as a personal insult because of their religious faith.

Now that the election is some months behind us, however, we can weigh the results more dispassionately. It is, indeed, not entirely to be regretted that four months go by between the election of a president and his inauguration. Hot blood has time to cool, hasty conclusions can be revised, a truer perspective can be had. And so it is not out of place to review just now the part religious bigotry really played in Governor Smith's defeat and President Hoover's victory.

Undoubtedly there was a great deal of religious bigotry during the campaign. And lest I offend some admirable men, let me hasten to add that by "bigotry" I do not mean a dignified discussion such as Mr. Marshall carried on with Governor Smith. By bigotry I mean, rather, an unreasoning prejudice which believes the most grotesque stories of, for instance, papal interference in American politics and about Catholics generally. I think that those of us who wish to see bigotry eliminated from our political life are supporting the bigots' propaganda by taking at their face value the bigots' own claims to importance. One of the most effective ways of discouraging bigotry is by showing its ineffectiveness. If Smith had been elected, that would have been the deadliest blow possible to bigotry. But since he was not elected, the next best thing under the circumstances is to show that bigotry was not responsible for his defeat.

I am not a politician, and can lay no claim to any special knowledge of inside politics. But I do feel that I have had more opportunities than most persons of knowing the temper of our people in several different sections of the country. During many years I have laboured as best I could to reduce the friction between Catholics and non-Catholics by reducing the ignorance on which bigotry is based. And I feel that the best contribution I can make just now towards that object is in trying to trim down somewhat the importance that the bigots attach to themselves in the recent election.

Beginning with the obvious facts, the first thing that stands out in the result of the election is that Al Smith polled a larger popular vote than any other Democratic candidate for the presidency, and it looked at one time as if the complete official returns might show that he polled a larger popular vote than any other candidate, with the one exception of Hoover. Smith may be assumed to have started with a handicap of over seven million votes, since in the previous election Coolidge beat Davis by that many votes. Any reduction of that Republican majority can be considered pure gain. And Smith did reduce it by over a million votes.

Moreover, the vote can be looked at from another standpoint. Davis received less than thirty per cent of the total vote in 1924, whereas Smith received more than forty per cent. That was a relative gain over Davis of nearly fifty per cent. That is, not only did Smith double Davis' popular vote in absolute numbers, but he made this very substantial gain in proportion to the total vote cast.

And the results can be put in what is perhaps an even more striking way. Four hundred and five thousand more votes, properly distributed, would have given Smith the victory. And four hundred and five thousand is only about one per cent of the total number of votes. I do not think that I am unduly optimistic in thinking that this is rather consoling from the standpoint of one who wishes to see bigotry eliminated from our political life.

If we analyse the popular vote from another angle, we can form a rough estimate of the number of non-Catholics who must have voted for Smith. About a third of the total population of the United States exercised the franchise in this election. If the same ratio prevailed for Catholics, Smith could have received at most seven million votes of Catholics. That would leave about nine million non-Catholic votes to make up his total. But it is safe to say that Smith did not receive the vote of every Catholic.

It is true that the fact that Smith was the first Catholic to be nominated by a major party, and the fight made against him on the score of his religion, tended to place Catholics behind him more unanimously than would otherwise have been the case. Nevertheless, Catholics did divide in this election, as they have divided in every other. The normal Republican loyalty of some Catholics overcame any tendency they may have had to vote for a co-religionist, and some Catholic Democrats scratched Smith because they were opposed to him on prohibition, or some other important issue.

At any rate Smith must have received as many non-Catholic votes as Davis received altogether in 1924, since Davis' vote was 8,617,454. And as the bulk of Catholics are probably Democrats anyhow, very likely something like half of Davis' vote was from Catholics. On this basis, Smith would have received twice as many non-Catholic votes as Davis got. In the light of these considerations, I hesitate to concede the overwhelming influence of the bigots, until the bigots produce considerably more evidence than they have so far brought forward.

But there is another, and perhaps better way of estimating the effect of bigotry on the election, and that is to go over the other elements in the situation and try to evaluate their influence. If any one of these other elements, or all of them together, may reasonably account for Smith's defeat, I am not going to yield the palm of victory to the bigots. From a

civic standpoint, it is best that we should not have a large minority feeling aggrieved because they have been the victims of religious bigotry. And while, of course, this would be no good reason for shutting our eyes to obvious facts, it is a reason for demanding conclusive evidence. I propose, then, to examine the evidence as to what elements other than religious bigotry may have been responsible for Smith's defeat.

First of all it should be remembered that Smith started with a terrible handicap in being a Democrat. I am a Democrat myself, but I must admit, rather unwillingly, that ever since the Civil War the Democratic party has been a minority party. In the past half century only two Democrats have been elected president, and both Cleveland and Wilson were elected to their first terms by what might be called a political accident.

Consequently, if we Catholics regulated our political life in this country by a Machiavellian ecclesiastical policy, I suppose the wise thing would have been to have opposed the nomination of any Catholic Democrat.

There is a great deal of truth in Will Rogers' remark, that no Democrat could have been elected, wet or dry, Catholic or Protestant. He said that Hoover could have beaten even Coolidge, if Coolidge had been running as a Democrat. Certainly, if Smith had been a Republican,—and consequently with no Tammany connections to hurt him in other portions of the country—four times elected Governor of New York, opposing a wet Protestant Democrat, his chances would have been enormously increased.

If this be true, or even approximately true, then we have no need to call in bigotry to account for Smith's defeat.

But Smith's Democracy was not the only element in the situation. There were others, making in the same direction of defeat. Smith started not only with the normal handicap of being a Democrat, but he had back of him the Democratic convention held at Madison Square Garden in 1924. In that convention, certain politicians used Smith to defeat McAdoo. And in order to defeat McAdoo they staged a terrific battle of twenty-eight days.

If the men who fought so vigorously for Smith at Madison Square Garden had only loved Smith more than they hated McAdoo, they would never have let their political animosities run away with their judgment in this way. They would have

made a reasonable effort to nominate Smith, and then they would have withdrawn him gracefully in favour of someone else — even McAdoo. Then Smith could have toured the country speaking for this other man, and incidentally putting himself over as the candidate for 1928. In this way the people would have come to know him better than was possible during the few short weeks from the middle of August to November 6th.

And in 1926, Smith's interests as a presidential candidate would have been better served by his going to the U.S. Senate instead of Wagner, because he would have become more of a national figure than by being governor for a fourth term. All this would seem to be the most elementary political strategy. When it was not followed, and when to these sins of omission and commission is added the original handicap of being a Democrat, I see no need of calling in religious bigotry for a major cause.

Moreover, if the line of action just indicated had been carried out, not only would the people of other sections have come to know Smith, but Smith would have come to know them. In summing up the handicaps under which Smith laboured, the *New York Evening Post* mentioned his "New Yorkism." The editor was apparently thinking of the prejudice against New Yorkers in other parts of the country. And in Smith's case this prejudice was intensified by his Tammany associations.

One can admire Smith for trying to give the country a different conception of a new Tammany, for not going back, even for the sake of the presidency, on the men who gave him his political start. But the admiration one may feel for his conduct comes largely from the courageousness of his course, and his course was courageous because he was attacking a very deep-seated prejudice.

And the prejudice against Tammany has nothing to do with Smith's religion. Catholic Democrats in Maryland and elsewhere outside New York have this prejudice.

But there is another way in which Smith's "New Yorkism" was probably a handicap. Smith knows his New York as perhaps no other man does. But his very intimacy with New York, his concern with his duties as legislator and as governor, precluded his knowing other sections. At least, Smith had seldom been outside of his own State. Smith had had no such opportunities as Roosevelt or Bryan of knowing

the temper of the people elsewhere. And Smith emphasized certain points in his campaign that undoubtedly appealed to New York City, and to the territory immediately adjacent to New York City, but which just as undoubtedly were anathema to people in other sections.

For instance, one of the issues Smith made most prominent was the need of abandoning national prohibition. Much that he said in his campaign about the evils of the present system of national prohibition was true. There has been an enormous amount of corruption under the system, and it is possible to get liquor at almost any place in the country. Nevertheless, vast numbers of voters—perhaps especially among the women—did not want a change. There is more truth, to my mind, in the statement that the 19th amendment saved the 18th, incidentally defeating Smith, than there is in attributing his defeat primarily to religious bigotry.

Smith's campaign speeches constituted a smashing attack upon the drys. By those speeches he created a remarkable enthusiasm in those already agreeing with him, and he polled a wonderful popular vote. Looking back upon the campaign, I account for the phenomenal reception he met everywhere as a sort of vicarious satisfaction the crowds got from hearing him turn his keen wit, his withering sarcasm against the people they were opposing. The men in these crowds would have liked to have done the same thing, just as cleverly and just as publicly, but they could not. And so they gave Smith a wholehearted support that few men in public life have ever received.

But at the same time, there may be two opinions as to whether Smith gained or lost more by this kind of campaign. He certainly doubled the Democratic vote and cut down the Republican lead. But I am inclined to think that he aroused an almost equally enthusiastic antagonism in those who started in disagreement with him. They were hurt by his sarcasm. Rightly or wrongly, they felt that at times he was grossly unfair to them. It has been said that people were either for Smith or against Smith, rather than for Hoover. And there is something to the epigram.

On a question such as this we can, of course, never get absolute certainty. But I may be pardoned the guess that if Smith had not emphasized the liquor issue, he would have carried the solid South. There would have been some bigotry in the South, and this bigotry would have cost Smith

a good many popular votes. But Smith would have had the electoral votes of the solid South just as his Democratic predecessors had. Religious bigotry would not have been strong enough *by itself* to break the ties binding the solid South to Democracy. But religious bigotry *plus* dry sentiment was strong enough to throw his opponent the votes by which he lost Texas, Virginia, Florida, and North Carolina.

In the event 11,210 Democrats in Texas, 12,258 Democrats in Virginia, 19,977 Democrats in Florida, and 25,158 Democrats in North Carolina voted against Smith because of his wetness. And they would not have voted against Smith had he simply accepted the Democratic platform as it was adopted, without his telegram to Houston, without his appointment of a wet Republican as campaign manager, and without his emphasis upon this issue in his speeches. I cannot prove this. But neither can the bigots prove the contrary, and demonstrate that they were the sole and unaided cause of his defeat. And until the bigots can prove their contention, I feel more comfort in taking this view of the situation.

More than this, I am convinced, too, that if the Democratic nominee had been a Protestant or a dry Catholic, he would not have carried Massachusetts and Rhode Island. These States are normally Republican, at least in presidential elections, to almost the same extent that the solid South is Democratic. Without the combination of a wet Catholic vote, Massachusetts and Rhode Island would have gone for Hoover.

That this diagnosis of the situation is correct is borne out to some extent by the results in New York. When a man has been four times elected governor of his State, and then loses that State as a candidate for president, I want the bigots to produce some very conclusive evidence that his defeat is due primarily to them. In Smith's case, a sufficient explanation would seem to be available without crediting the bigots with such influence. And that explanation is the habit of New York in presidential matters. It was Prosperity, rather than Protestantism, which cut into Smith's plurality in New York City, and so lost him the State. Many persons were willing to have a Democrat in Albany who preferred, for business reasons, to have a Republican in the White House.

It is true that this issue of prohibition is closely connected with religion, and that many Protestant ministers used their

churches to fight Smith. Personally, I think that they made a mistake in being politically active as ministers on this question. But at the same time I can see that their political activity was not necessarily directed against Smith as a Catholic. They may have been opposing him as a wet. Certainly many of these ministers had been just as active in other campaigns in opposing Protestant candidates who were wet. Just as I draw a line between Smith's Catholicism and his wetness, maintaining that his Catholicism has nothing to do with his wetness, so I yield the same privilege to them.

Some of these ministers—and I like to think by far the greater number—would not have fought Senator Thomas F. Walsh, since Walsh is dry. And if it had been a choice between a Catholic Democrat as dry as Walsh and a Protestant Republican as wet as Smith, there is good reason to believe that they would have supported the Catholic.

Much the same thing can be said about the Anti-Saloon League. Undoubtedly this League has been identified in large measure with the Protestant Churches. But that has been because the Anti-Saloon League has no qualms of conscience about using religious machinery to secure its end of electing dry candidates, and some Protestant Churches have no hesitation in thus co-operating with the League. The Anti-Saloon League would use any Catholic priest in the same way who would consent to being used. The League has fought wet Protestants just as bitterly as it has fought wet Catholics. And if at times it has yielded to the temptation to reinforce dry opposition to a wet candidate by utilizing religious prejudices, I have yet to be convinced that this was the dominating influence in the election just passed.

It is something of a digression, perhaps, to consider the psychology underlying a political campaign, and yet I think that it has a place in this discussion. A political campaign has sometimes been likened to a military campaign, and it has been said that a political candidate, like a general, cannot be successful unless he carries on an offensive campaign. But there is a fundamental and quite obvious difference between the two. In a military campaign a general is limited to the army he has. His purpose is to manoeuvre this army in such a way as to crush his opponent's forces. He does not expect to increase his own army materially by deserters from the enemy's ranks. In a political campaign, however, this is just what a candidate must try to do. If he belongs to a

minority party, he must win over a sufficient number from the other side to make up for his initial weakness.

As a consequence of this fundamental fact, a candidate's speeches should be directed to those of moderate opinions in between the two groups of staunch party men. It is only these moderates who may be persuaded to change their views, and denunciation, sarcasm, invective, ridicule, will not effect the desired change. All this will please his own partisans who need no persuasion, but it will serve to enrage the more emphatically opposed, and it will leave the moderates where they were—or perhaps more firmly against him. An offensive campaign, therefore, is likely to be "offensive" in the sense of offending numerous voters who might be won over by more conciliatory tactics.

Although I am an amateur in politics, I may lay some claim to experience in the religious field, and I am confident the same psychology applies in both domains. As a Catholic I belong to a minority group in this country. Consequently, in presenting Catholicism to my fellow citizens, in trying to win over others and make converts, I cannot afford to inveigh and denounce. Without compromising my own position, I must nevertheless be calm, courteous, kindly, to those who start in disagreement with me.

From listening in on Smith's speeches, I must confess that he did not seem to be going about the matter in a way that was calculated to make converts of those who started in opposition. I may be wrong, but Smith seemed to be accepting the analogy between war and politics, and he used very direct and emphatic English in his attack. I missed that genial humour which he possesses in such abundance, and which has been one of his chief political assets. Smith was witty, but it was a biting wit that irritates the object of it, instead of winning him.

We can, then, account for Smith's defeat without attributing a major share in this to religious bigotry. His Democracy, the battle of Madison Square Garden, his wetness, his New Yorkism, are sufficient to explain his failure. Considering all these handicaps, it would have taken a political miracle to have elected Smith. The wonder of the race is not that he lost, but that he ran so well. No other Democrat could have made as good a showing. If we cannot completely exonerate his opponents from all religious bigotry, at least we can bring in against the exaggerated claims of the bigots the Scotch verdict, "not proven."

All this is encouraging to those who look upon our American principle of religious toleration as the most precious political heritage we have received from the founders of our Republic. I shall continue to cling to the conviction that in the main we are still true to that principle. Naturally, we are not perfect in this regard, any more than as Christians we are perfect in keeping the Ten Commandments. But as we take a wider survey of our history, we may well congratulate ourselves upon a closer and closer approach to perfection.

And we may all, Americans of the Catholic faith and of other faiths, take hope for the future in the splendid testimony borne to the grip of religious freedom in this country by great outstanding Protestants irrespective of party affiliation. It would be invidious, perhaps, to single out any particular men for such a roll of honour. But because of my own close association with Columbia University, I may be pardoned for mentioning the president of that institution—Nicholas Murray Butler.

As a Catholic, I care little about a Catholic president, though as an American I should like to see this death blow given to the ugly beast of religious bigotry still showing some life in our midst. But I am not discouraged by Smith's defeat. As I analyse the election more closely, I am surprised that there is less evidence of bigotry than I had expected, and I think we should not play into the hands of over-vocal bigots by taking their claims too seriously. And so I look forward hopefully to the future, confident as ever in the fundamental fairness of our American people, and trusting unfalteringly in their essential loyalty to the principle of religious freedom.

J. ELLIOT ROSS, C.S.P.

## LITERATURE AND LIFE IN THE BIBLE

**A**N attractive by-way of the study of Literature at the moment is that of regarding it in its connection with the events of the time. If we accept the current division of the subject as that of the Literature of Knowledge and the Literature of Power, it is of course rather to the latter than the former that we direct our thought. Where the one seeks to instruct, to convince, to regulate, the other has for its province to move, to inspire, to arouse ardour. In that great library of inspired Literature, the Bible, there are transcendent examples of both; and the examples of creative thought are not exhausted in the books recognized as poetry. Besides the collection of lyrics known as the Psalms, the dramatic poem of Job, the figurative and parabolic Sentences of the Proverbs, the elegiac cantos of the Preacher and of Wisdom, and the recognized poetic imagery of the Prophetic books, there are many examples scattered in the historical records which most eloquently reveal the solemn relations of Literature and Life.

All great literatures implicitly acknowledge, and their students delight to find, the early sub-stratum of oral verse and story which moved their ancestors, stirred them to fine deeds, or commemorated the tears of things. So the Library of the Hebrew Scriptures handed down to us is undoubtedly only a tithe of the spoken words which, in dirge, or elegy, or paean, or legend, enriched the minds and fired the hearts of the Chosen People. Those selected here are Songs illustrative of the primal passions, endeavours and verities, whose themes have been the subjects of poetic treatment in all ages and among all nations having a past and a history.

i. The first, and probably the most ancient in the Old Testament Scriptures is the *Dirge of Lamech*.<sup>1</sup> According to Hebrew tradition the fugitive Cain, desolately protected from a violent death by the murder brand upon his forehead, was unwittingly slain by Lamech, his descendant. Five generations only had lived before the actual tragedy which ended the unhappy wanderer's life, but we may think of the legend handed down as a dread narration, and presently enshrined

<sup>1</sup> Gen. iv. 23—4.

in the form of the Dirge we know. If the battle-cry is the germ of the Epic, there came the slow moments when some thinkers extended the syllabic challenge into the Story. So, too, since man meets death first by the hand of his brother man, there came the moment when the dread penalty, and the escape therefrom, moved a reflective mind to think back to the tragic moment, and to portray the anguished soul of the one who had thus defeated the Divine purpose.

In the setting we have the primitive conditions of life suggested. Impelled by remorse and fear, Lamech avows his hapless deed to his wives Ada and Zillah, whose sons, *Jabel*, "the father of such as dwell in tents, and of herdsmen," and *Jubal*, "the father of them that play upon the harp and the organs"; and *Tubal-Cain*, "the hammerer and artificer in every work of brass and iron," may be obscurely hinted at as founders of civilizations and the veritable offspring of a poet.

"Hear my voice, ye wives of Lamech;  
Hearken to my speech:  
I have slain a man,  
—To the wounding of myself,  
And a stripling,  
—To my own bruising.

Sevenfold vengeance shall be taken for Cain:  
But for Lamech seventy times sevenfold."

Though the battle-cry may be the most ancient form of lyrical expression the Dirge is nearly as old, as one would expect. Out of it grew the Elegy; and all the many forms of Valediction may be recognized as akin to this.

ii. Hence the patriarchal Blessing of Jacob,<sup>1</sup> couched as it is in symbol and metaphor, is among the primitive forms of poetry. In it are massed together the traditional characteristics, heroic or mean; the achievement or the failure, the glory or the shame, of the descendants of Israel in the tribal period.

"Ruben, excelling in gifts, greater in command . . ."  
"Juda, thee shall thy brethren praise;  
Thy hands shall be on the necks of thy enemies . . .  
Juda is a lion's whelp. . . . Who shall rouse him?  
The sceptre shall not be taken away from Juda . . .  
Till He come that is to be sent,  
He, the Expectation of the nations. . . ."

Zabulon dwelling on the sea-shore, in the road of ships; Issachar the strong ass, that saw rest that it was good; Dan,

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xlix.

a snake in the way ; Gad, girded to fight ; Nephtali, a hart let loose ; Benjamin, a ravening wolf ;—these all enshrine or suggest the outlook which fostered the passionate patriotism of the race. Midway in the ordered apostrophes is the sudden

"I will look for Thy salvation O Lord,"  
and this, with the special Blessings on Juda and on Joseph,

"A growing son, a growing son and comely to behold,"  
entitle the mysterious anticipations to rank as Messianic.

iii. Next is the *Song of Victory*, of Moses the prophet and Mary the prophetess, celebrating the marvellous deliverance of Israel<sup>1</sup> from the Egyptian captivity. This is at once devout in spirit and elaborate in construction. Not for nothing was its maker "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," and was among those praised many centuries later who, "by their skill sought out musical tunes and published canticles . . ." For there is not only evidence of what was to be known as antiphonal singing, "choir against choir," but the song itself is framed on some similar model of technique. After the introductory phrases,

"Let us sing to the Lord : for He is gloriously magnified"  
and the proclaiming of the great occasion in

"The horse and the rider he hath thrown into the sea,"  
there follows the most individual and original ascription, quoted and enlarged upon in the days to come, but never excelled :

"The Lord is my strength and my praise :  
He is become salvation to me.  
He is my God, I will glorify Him,  
The God of my father, and I will exalt Him."

Then the recital bursts into narrative :

"The Lord is a man of war : Almighty is His Name." We can hear the shout down the ages ; and the Story marches on : "Pharaoh's chariots and his army and his chosen captains—the depths have covered them," and with the re-iteration, later to become a marked feature of Hebrew verse, "they are sunk to the bottom like a stone." Then there comes a devout ascription : "Thy right hand, O Lord" : in its universal aspect, "is magnified in strength" ; in the particular instance, "hath slain the enemy." In ardent soliloquy there is reconstructed the amazing conditions of the rescue ; "the flowing

<sup>1</sup> Exodus xv.

waters stood . . . " and a dramatic interposition of the intention of the mighty foe : The enemy said

"I will pursue : and overtake :  
I will divide the spoils :  
My soul shall have its fill.  
I will draw my sword ;  
My hand shall slay them !"

And then is resumed the narrative, whispered surely : "Thy wind blew and the sea covered them : they sank as lead in the mighty waters." Again ascription and re-iteration, which soon becomes of wider import than that of the immediate occasion : with prophetic fervour the Divine frustration includes nations and peoples not yet concerned : Philistium, Edom, Moab, Chanaan. A ringing strophe declares "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever"; then once again the marvellous deliverance is recited.

The story continues : "So Mary the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand ; and all the women went forth after her with timbrels and with dances ; and she began the song to them, saying, 'Let us sing to the Lord' ;" and the great tribute is again proclaimed in ordered fashion :

"He is gloriously magnified :  
The horse and his rider he hath thrown into the sea."

Well might the hearts of all beat high ; everyone must in his measure have had a conception of being "borne upon eagles' wings" and signally favoured. But the days of trial were near. The military order in which they had entered upon their mysterious journey was made the basis of the system of government, with able men as "rulers over thousands, and over hundreds, and over fifties, and over tens" ; and at the foot of Sinai may be heard the heart-whole, united chorus of "All that the Lord hath spoken, we will do" ; repeated at the Reading of the Law with the sacred promise, "We will be obedient." <sup>1</sup>

iv. To this period belongs a fragment of Song, unique in its subject and occasion. The pools of water failed, the streams from the rock were stilled, and, obedient to "the Rock that followed them," Moses gathered the people together for a solemn and united task. The patriarchal labour of digging a well seems to have been invested with so profound a meaning as to have become almost a ritual act. The chronicler tells the story briefly, spends no time in descrip-

<sup>1</sup> Exodus xix. 8 ; xxiv. 7.

tion, but the frugal details leave us impressed with the fullness of what is not said. For Israel sang this song:<sup>1</sup>

"Let the well spring up : the well  
Which our princes dug,  
And the chiefs of the people prepared,  
By the direction of the law giver,  
With their staves."

v. The next song to be noted is very different in theme, structure and occasion.<sup>2</sup> It belongs to the heroic age of the Hebrew history. After a prosperous peace of eighty years there came a back-sliding of the people and they fell under the aggression of the warlike Jabin, whose captain, Sisera, was believed to be irresistible in attack. But, under the leadership of Debora, judge and prophetess, and the inglorious Barak, an amazing victory was won by Israel; and "In that day . . . they sang"; and said,

"O you who have willingly offered your lives to danger  
Bless the Lord . . ."

This striking expression of tribute is repeated, with the addition

"My heart loveth the princes of Israel,  
O you that of your own good will  
Offered yourselves to the danger,  
Bless the Lord."

Many characteristics in this Song of Victory claim attention. In outline there may be seen, besides the tribute mentioned, devout ascription to God; retrospect, with a touch of scorn for the peaceful days; a rough sketch of the course of the battle; mingled rebuke and praise of individual tribes; some stormy strophes heralded by the announcement "War from heaven was made against them . . . the stars in their order and courses fought against Sisera"; then the vivid relation of the treachery of Jahel; with the ironical description of the fallen Sisera's mother and his wiser wife. The rhythmic swing of the phrases fits the simple terseness of expression; once heard they are known:

"He asked her water; and she gave him milk;  
And offered him butter in a dish for princes . . ."

"She put her left hand to the nail  
And her right hand to the workman's hammer . . ."

"At her feet he fell. He fainted. And he died."

"His mother looked out at a window . . .

"Why is his chariot so long in coming?  
Why are the feet of his horses so slow?"

<sup>1</sup> Numbers xxi. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Judges v.

And the consoling answer :

“Perhaps he is now dividing the spoil . . .  
Garments of divers colours . . . ”

The unrelenting

“So let all Thy enemies perish, O Lord”  
is followed by the beautiful simile,

“But let them that love Thee shine,  
As the sun shineth in his rising.”

vi. This early example of a public thanksgiving, the first national anthem and the forerunner of patriotic verse, is followed by one of very different mould. The *Song of Anna*<sup>1</sup> when she presented in the holy place her little son, the child of promise, is recognized as the foreshadowing of that greater Canticle the *Magnificat*. We may well suppose that Our Blessed Lady was familiar with this historic expression of love and devotion and, besides framing her own on similar lines, incorporated actual expressions in it :

ANNA.	THE BLESSED VIRGIN.
“My heart hath rejoiced in the Lord	“My soul doth magnify the Lord
And my horn is exalted in my God”	And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour”
“There is none holy as the Lord is”	“Holy is His name”
“The bow of the mighty is overcome	“He hath put down the mighty
The weak are girt with strength”	And hath exalted the humble”
“They that were full have hired themselves out for bread	“He hath filled the hungry with good things
The hungry are filled”	The rich He hath sent empty away”

vii. Of the songs of victory and praise of the conqueror,<sup>2</sup> sung by the choirs of women after David's defeat of the Philistine champion, there is preserved only the exultant climax which was fraught with such unhappy consequences. Advancing in stately measure, striking their tabrets and plucking the strings of their lyres the antiphonal chorus rang out :

“Saul hath slain his thousands  
And David his ten thousands . . . ”

<sup>1</sup> I Kings (I Samuel) ii. 1—10.

<sup>2</sup> I Kings xviii. 6, 7.

The historian continues :

"And Saul did not look on David with a good eye from that day."

viii. The subject of this tribute becomes the singer of the next recorded song, the *Elegy on Saul and Jonathan*.<sup>1</sup> An impressive proem ushers in the theme; the far-reaching effects of the death of the King in the land of the victors is one aspect; the indignity of its manner, another; and in his shocked horror the poet invokes nature to share. Then the high lament for king and prince, mounting to the cry of the desolate friend :

"Consider, O Israel, for them that are dead . . .

The illustrious of Israel are slain on thy mountains :  
How are the valiant fallen !"

"Tell it not in Geth, publish it not in the streets of Ascalon,  
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice."

"Ye mountains of Gelboe.

Let not dew nor rain come upon you . . .

For there was cast away the shield of the valiant,  
The shield of Saul . . . "

"The arrow of Jonathan never turned back  
The sword of Saul did not return empty . . . "

"Saul and Jonathan,  
Lovely, and comely in their life,  
Even in death they were not divided."

"Ye daughters of Israel, weep over Saul :  
He clothed you with scarlet in delights,  
He gave you ornaments of gold for your attire."

"How are the valiant fallen !  
Jonathan slain in the high places !"

"I grieve for thee, my brother Jonathan :  
Exceedingly beautiful and amiable to me,  
Above the love of women ;  
As the mother loveth her only son  
So did I love thee."

"How are the valiant fallen . . . "

English poetry is especially rich in the Elegy; the blend of Celt and Teuton temperaments has produced a sensitiveness to the irrevocable sentence of separation, and notably of that of friends.

ix. The same singer, David, has bequeathed yet another dirge, or at least a poignant fragment of one. The father who could summon philosophic reflection to his aid on the

<sup>1</sup> II Kings i. 18-27.

death of the child of his erring passion,<sup>1</sup> was prostrate with sorrow when the capricious, lawless darling of his heart, ingrate and rebel, but "exceedingly beautiful from the sole of the foot to the crown of his head . . ." the young prince Absalom, died ignominiously in battle against his father. Covering his head he cried with a loud voice :

"O my son Absalom, O Absalom my son ! O my son !  
Would to God that I might die for thee,  
Absalom my son, my son !"

x. Nor are these examples of elegiac verse the only ones that may be found in the records of the Hebrew Kingdom. A fragment is given, which is almost certainly the traditional rendering of a stately and ceremonial commemoration, as the lament of the King on the death of his great general, Abner.

"Not as cowards are wont to die,  
Hath Abner died :  
Thy hands were not bound,  
Nor thy feet laden with fetters :  
But as men fall before the children of iniquity,  
So didst thou fall."

The historian relates :

"And all the people repeating it wept over him."<sup>2</sup>

Recent utterances of responsible authorities have lately testified to the general ignorance of the Sacred Scriptures among the English youth of to-day. And while nothing could be further from Christian reverence and Catholic belief than approval of the study of the Bible for its literary value only, yet all may acknowledge that with the loss of devout confidence in its teaching as the inspired Word of God, there is also the loss of an appreciative regard for the beautiful vehicle of thought in which it has come to us.

S. CUNNINGTON, M.A.

<sup>1</sup> II Kings xii. 23. "I shall go to him rather; but he shall not return to me."

<sup>2</sup> II Kings iii. 33, 34.

## THE FATHERS AND THE HISTORICITY OF PARADISE IN REFUTATION OF BISHOP GORE.

THE character of "A New Commentary on Holy Scripture," of which Dr. Gore is editor in chief, is by now familiar to those interested in Biblical studies, and in general to all who watch religious tendencies outside the Church. Its most striking feature lies in the open manner in which has been sacrificed the age-long tradition of Christianity that the Bible as the word of God is in itself free from every error. Dr. Gore now tells the world not only that there are mistakes even in the Gospel narratives, but that the early chapters of Genesis are in substance folk-lore that has not been elevated into history, that the stories of the Patriarchs, though they may embody real history, are, as they stand, legend, and so forth. Naturally Dr. Gore would like to lessen the shock caused by such views to devout Anglicans by assuring them that he has the sanction of Christian antiquity, or at least by showing that not dissimilar opinions were anciently held in the Church. He accordingly appeals to Origen and other early writers.

The great scholar Origen declared that it was part of "the ecclesiastical tradition" that Scripture has a double sense, the plain and the hidden, and he claimed that there is much in the books of the Old Testament which cannot be true literally or historically, and much which in its literal sense is not for edification, which must be interpreted only according to its "spiritual, *i.e.*, allegorical meaning." "Many of the Fathers" . . . did not interpret as history the early stories of Genesis, but regarded them (with Gregory of Nyssa) as "ideas" or "doctrines in the form of a story" (see ref. in "Lux Mundi," xx. ff. and 262f.).

The average reader has neither the time, nor perhaps the inclination, to turn up references; and will take Dr. Gore at his word, and presume that everything is as stated. If anyone, however, moved to astonishment at the startling declaration that "many of the Fathers" rejected the historicity of Paradise, should look up the pages referred to, his confident expectation of finding there the promised references is doomed

to disappointment. In the first place the "many" Fathers are replaced by the names of a few. Secondly the only references given are to the works of Origen, and to the "De Fide Catholica" long ascribed to Boethius. For the rest the reader is granted the mere mention of a Father's name ("Athanasius speaks of Paradise as a 'figure' "); even in one case he is expected to be satisfied with an appeal to "a mediaeval Greek writer." If the enquirer is still undeterred and carries his researches further, his conclusions will be somewhat as set forth in the following pages.

But first let us remember that a Father does not necessarily deny the literal historical sense because he indulges in allegorical interpretations. Thus St. Gregory the Great in the twenty-second of his "Homiliae in Evangelia," n. 2, speaking of John xx., where it is related how Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved ran to the empty sepulchre, comes to the conclusion that John symbolized the Synagogue and Peter the Church. Again in the tenth of the same series of homilies, n. 6, he explains that the gold offered by the Magi denotes wisdom, the frankincense the virtue of prayer, and the myrrh corporal mortification. These allegorical applications do not imply any denial that Peter and John really existed or that the Magi really presented their gifts. This is evident both from the homilies quoted, and from the golden rule of "spiritual interpretation" which he lays down in the fortieth of these homilies, n. 1: "In the words of sacred writ, we must first give heed to the historical truth, and afterwards seek the spiritual allegorical meaning; for the fruits which allegory enables us to pluck are sweet when it is first solidly rooted in the truth of history."

Dr. Gore, we have seen, claims St. Athanasius as an allegorizer who rejects the historicity of Paradise. As a matter of fact, the saying of the Saint's appealed to ("Oratio contra Gentes," n. 2) means the exact opposite of what Dr. Gore reads into it, and is really a passing insistence on the terrestrial and mundane nature of the Paradise which God Almighty planted for the use and habitation of our first parents. That he did not deny the historicity of the stories which Dr. Gore is pleased to call folk-lore is manifest from his writings. In his letter to the Bishops of Egypt and Lybia, n. 2, he points out how the devil deceived Eve by twisting the sense of the words of God. In his dissertation on the Incarnation of the Word, n. 3 (Migne, P.G. 25, 101), he says that in making our first parents rational creatures God communicated to them

some adumbration of His Own Word, and that having introduced them into Paradise He gave them a law, in order that, if they preserved grace and remained good, they might lead the life proper to Paradise without pain, sorrow, or anxiety, in addition to having the promise of immortality in heaven, and on the other hand, that if they transgressed the law, they should know that they were subject to the natural corruption of death, and should no longer live in Paradise. Then in his exposition of the fiftieth Psalm, n.7, he clearly teaches the doctrine of original sin, which is intimately bound up with the sin of Adam : "All the posterity of Adam are conceived in iniquity and fall under the condemnation of our ancestor." There is another passage worth quoting for the reason that it occurs in the paragraph following that imagined by Dr. Gore to contain Athanasius' rejection of the story of Adam and Eve. It is mentioned in the same sense in the "New Commentary" (p. 692) by Dr. Darwell Stone, who entirely misses its significance, as it is an acute piece of religious psychology based on the literal interpretation of the text. It is found in the "Oratio contra Gentes," n.3 :

The first man, as long as he kept his mind directed to God and the contemplation of Him, avoided the contemplation of carnal things ; but when by the counsel of the serpent he withdrew from the thought of God, he began to pay attention to himself, and then they fell into carnal concupiscence, and knew that they were naked, and knowing were ashamed. They knew themselves to be naked not so much on account of the absence of clothes, but because they had become stripped of the contemplation of divine things, and had diverted their thoughts to contrary things.

These words are an explanation of the fact that, after their sin of disobedience Adam and Eve realized and felt shame at their nakedness, because their rebellion was reflected in their own complex nature, what is theologically known as the gift of integrity having been lost.

The reader will now be ready for the explanation of the passage cited by Dr. Gore, in which the great Doctor of Alexandria speaks of Adam as living "in that place which holy Moses metaphorically called Paradise." We have here a passing condemnation of the error into which some early Christians not unnaturally fell, of confusing the earthly para-

dise of our first parents and that for instance to which St. Paul was rapt. Tertullian provides an example of this confusion in his "Apologeticus," n. 47, where he describes paradise as "a place of divine delight destined for the reception of the spirits of the saints, shut off from the knowledge of the common world by the dividing wall of that encircling fire," an allusion to the flaming sword by which the Cherubim guarded the approach to paradise after the expulsion of Adam and Eve. In the minds of early Christians the word paradise was apt to suggest, first and foremost, a blessed abode reserved for the just after death; and St. Athanasius says that it was by a metaphorical application of the name of this abode that the home of our first parents was called paradise. So far from rejecting its historicity the Saint is insisting on the terrestrial nature of this home of Adam and Eve.

Dr. Gore appeals also to the authority of St. Gregory of Nyssa. Now it is true that this Saint does explain certain elements of the story allegorically. Thus in his "Oratio Catechetica," ch. viii., he rejects the literal interpretation of the leather tunics made by Almighty God for Adam and Eve, for, he asks, what kind of animals could have been slain and skinned to provide these clothes. This appears at first an unintelligible reason. Were not the animals created before the fall? So what difficulty could there be in finding animals for the purpose? But if St. Gregory held some form of the view we have seen to have been reprobated by St. Athanasius, his thought becomes plain. If instead of regarding Adam's earthly home as metaphorically named paradise after the celestial paradise, as St. Athanasius suggests, or the abode of the departed just as metaphorically named after the terrestrial paradise, as we would say, he regarded the two as identical and non-terrestrial, then it is natural enough that he should understand the leather tunics metaphorically and ask what animals could have been killed to provide the materials. That this was his view appears from his work "De Hominis Opificio," ch. xix. After showing at the close of the previous chapter that in the next world we shall neither eat nor drink, he proposes himself a difficulty: "Perhaps some one will say that man will not return again to the same form of life, if it is the case that, whereas we used to have to eat, hereafter we shall be freed from this office." We should answer that there is here no true difficulty at all, as man will not return to his primitive mode of existence. Not so St. Gregory. He supposes that we shall, and solves the difficulty by explaining

that, when he hears the words of Holy Scripture, he knows of another food other than the bodily, namely another and analogous form of nourishment, the enjoyment of which affects only the soul. Through a misunderstanding based on the double use of the word "paradise" he found himself led to interpret certain elements of the story metaphorically, but he does not reject the historicity of the story itself, nor the real existence of Adam and Eve. His view therefore gives no support whatever to the entirely different and subversive opinions of Dr. Gore.

We may now turn to St. Irenaeus, from whom also Dr. Gore seeks to gain support. "A mediæval Greek writer," he says, "who had more of Irenaeus than remains to us, declared that 'he did not know how those who kept to the letter and took the account of the temptation historically rather than allegorically could meet the arguments of Irenaeus against him.' " Why does Dr. Gore withhold from his readers the name of this witness to the tenability of his modernistic opinions? He is no other than St. Anastasius Sinaita and an inspection of the passage in its context, in the work entitled "In Hexaemeron" (Migne, P.G. 89, 1013ff.) does not support the Bishop's implied interpretation of it. The reader would gather from Dr. Gore that St. Anastasius himself refused to see in the story of the temptation and fall a narrative of actual facts, and fell back on some purely allegorical interpretation. This is not the case. He accepts the story as a narration of fact, though confessing himself unable to understand how it should be interpreted. "What in actual fact," he says, "was the action of God in regard to the serpent that is spoken of, and the tree and the woman, . . . and how matters were enacted from the beginning, must be left to God alone, who made them and spoke and knew." There is some obscurity in his language; but it is clear that he does not deny that the story of the temptation represents real objective facts, though he cannot say exactly what those facts were in detail. In other words, he does not wish to allegorize the whole story, but feels that certain elements of it are not intended to be taken in the literal historical sense. Here he is, to some extent at least, on common ground with all Christians, as none understand by the serpent merely an irrational creature acting and speaking on its own account. He explicitly dissociates himself from those who rejected the literal sense: "Let this be understood in conformity with the letter of the exterior veil and body of Scripture, lest we give a handle to swine and

dogs (men who delight in vituperation), who say that these things were not done according to the letter." (*Ibid.* : col. 1015).

But what of the mind of St. Irenaeus, whom St. Anastasius purports to be quoting? It is well known how easily spurious writings were fathered on to celebrated authors in early times; and it will be sufficient to mention that the genuinity of the passage in question is doubted by no less a scholar than Harnack. In any case it is certain that Dr. Gore's rejection of Paradise and the fall is quite alien to the mind of the Bishop of Lyons as shown in his admitted writings. That Irenaeus accepted the fall-story as history, may be seen in "*Contra Haereses*," (v. 23) where the Saint studies the words of the tempter, enumerates his lies, and gives it as his opinion that the devil only learnt of the divine prohibition from the words of Eve. In the same chapter on the analogy of the death of Our Saviour, he attempts to show that Adam ate the forbidden fruit on the sixth day of the week, an argument no one would work out who denied the historicity of the fact. Irenaeus deals with the fall also in book III., ch. xxiii., n. 5, where he discourses on the "aprons" of fig-leaves, and again understands the story literally. By the girdle he made, Adam showed, he says, his repentance, since he covered himself with fig-leaves, though there were many other kinds of leaves he might have used that would have been less irritating to his body. And he goes on to say that in his self-humiliation Adam would always have kept this clothing of fig-leaves, had not God, who is merciful, clothed him and Eve with garments of skin. After these quotations further references seem unnecessary, but we may mention the simple, straightforward treatment Irenaeus presents of the same topics in his newly-discovered work on the "*Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*," nn. 11-16.<sup>1</sup> The result of the Bishop's investigations illustrates once more how desire governs perception and how we may generally find what we eagerly look for, but it was hardly to be expected that he should ask us to take the statement of an unnamed "mediaeval Greek writer" as to the beliefs of Irenaeus when we have them clearly and copiously expressed in the Saint's extant writings.

Another authority is appealed to by Dr. Gore in these terms :

A Latin writer of the fifth or sixth century, who gives an interesting summary of the Catholic Faith, and is

<sup>1</sup> See "*Texte und Untersuchungen*," xxxi., fasc. 1.

clearly nothing else but a recorder of accepted beliefs, after speaking of the origin and fall of man and woman, continues thus: "These things are known through God's revelation to His servant Moses, whom He willed to be aware of the state and origin of man, as the books he produced testify. For all the divine authority (*i.e.*, the scriptural revelation) appears to exist under such a mode as is either the mode of history, which narrates only what happened, or the mode of allegory in such sense that it cannot represent the course of history, or a mode made up of these two so as to remain both historical and allegorical."

The treatise thus quoted from is the short and sober exposition of the Catholic Faith, already alluded to, and long ascribed to Boethius (Migne, P.L. 64, 1333 seq.). One thing is certain. The author accepts the story of paradise and the fall literally. He recounts all the main incidents of the story of Adam and Eve; and clearly understands them in the literal historical sense, as the reader may easily convince himself by a perusal of the passage, too long for full quotation here. It is moreover extremely probable, to say the least, considering the author's simple, plain style that by this "allegorical mode" he understands such writings as the Canticle of Canticles. If this is the case, as it seems to be, this writer lends no support whatever to Dr. Gore's rejection of the historical character of many ostensibly historical narratives of Holy Scripture. This completes the list of writers mentioned by Dr. Gore, except that he remarks that "Clement . . . in Alexandria and the mediæval Anselm in the West treat of the seven days' creation as allegory and not history." Into this statement it is not necessary to enter. The present paper is confined to the question of paradise, because the first chapter of Genesis differs radically in character from the second and third.

We must now return to Origen, whose authority is invoked, as we have seen above, as that of a great scholar. Origen, of course, is classed as an early ecclesiastical writer, but not technically as a "Father"; and it must be remembered that the authority of the Fathers rests, not on their scholarly attainments, valuable as these are, but on their being faithful witnesses to the apostolic tradition and to the beliefs of the Church in their day. That Origen was not a faithful witness

to the apostolic tradition is shown by the fact that many of his doctrines were condemned by the Church as heretical. He himself should not be styled a heretic, as he wrote and taught in good faith, and the condemnation of his opinions by the Church occurred long after his death. Still, though he was not a heretic, his views have been anathematized by the Church as heretical; and consequently he is a dangerous and suspect ally. But even Origen would not subscribe to Dr. Gore's rejection of Paradise and the fall as folk-lore. Origen believed in Paradise and he believed in the fall. He held strange views, however, about the pre-existence of souls, which he imagined to be banished into this world and imprisoned in bodies as a result of sin. This theory he had to reconcile with the Biblical account of Adam and Eve; and he did so, not by rejecting the story as a whole, but by allegorizing certain elements of it. The paradise of Adam and Eve he identified with the paradise to which St. Paul was rapt, and this he placed in the third heaven. Here our first parents lived as spirits. It was, so he thought, only when they sinned that they were clothed with bodies, and ejected into this world. It will be seen at once that he could not consistently with his theory understand the leather aprons literally, for before leaving paradise they had no bodies to clothe. He therefore allegorized the tunics or aprons to mean bodies. It is also evident what violence all this does to the text, and it is no wonder that he aroused the keenest opposition, and was spoken of in the strongest terms of condemnation. Thus St. Epiphanius, in connection with his allegorizing of paradise, calls him "raving" or "half-witted" (*ο θειλατος Ωριγένης*, "Ancoratus," n. 54). St. Jerome also speaks of him as "doting" or "raving" (*delirat et in hoc loco allegoricus interpres*, "Com. in Jer." 27, 9; *et in hoc loco delirus interpres somniat*, *ibid. on 29, 14ff.*). St. John Chrysostom is equally outspoken: "For this reason blessed Moses inserted the name of the place in Scripture in order that men disposed to vain nonsense might not be able to deceive the ears of the simpler sort, saying that paradise is not on the earth but in heaven and indulging in suchlike mythological dreams" ("Hom. 13 in Gen." n. 3). What St. Basil thought of Origen's allegories may be judged from his dismissing allegories that destroyed the literal sense as "old wives' tales" (*γραώδεις μύθοις* "Hom. in Hexaemeron," 3, 9. These expressions are strong and proceed from redoubtable champions of the Faith. They

show conclusively that Origen's views were never countenanced by the Church. But be it noted, the opinions of Origen to which Dr. Gore appeals in support of his own, though repudiated in unsparing language by leading Fathers, as we have just seen, were not so subversive of Biblical teaching as those of Dr. Gore himself. Origen believed in the real existence of Paradise, though he entertained strange notions as to its locality. Dr. Gore regards it as folk-lore. Origen believed in the fall of our first parents, though he wrongly conceived them to have been incorporeal at the time of their sin. Dr. Gore in dismissing the story of Paradise, dismisses with it the story of the fall. From that position a short and logical step brings one to denial of Redemption.

To sum up the result of our enquiry, it only remains to say that not one of the Fathers and early writers appealed to by Dr. Gore lends support to his views. They one and all believed in the reality of paradise; and not one of them would subscribe to the views in support of which their names are with such mistaken confidence invoked.

EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE.

# MISCELLANEA

## I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

### PROHIBITION UN-CATHOLIC.

WE have been reminded by a friendly reader that, in inveighing against the absolute prohibition of the manufacture, sale and transportation of intoxicating beverages, on the ground of Catholic principle, we ignore the body of Catholic opinion in the United States which is in favour of the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Law. Alas! We do not ignore it so much as deplore it, for that Catholic support does not seem to us thoroughly well-informed. It is only natural that those who have benefited from the fact that funds necessary for their well-being are no longer wasted in drink should welcome the legislation which has brought about such salutary effects. Where people are so weak in character that, given the opportunity of self-indulgence, they forget their duty to God, to the Church, to their dependants, to their employers, all these obligations may possibly be better fulfilled when the opportunity is taken away from them. And no doubt, imperfect as has been its enforcement, Prohibition in the States has done a great deal of good in this way. In similar fashion, a law which deprived people of the use of one or other of their senses or faculties, would prevent those who commonly misused those senses sinfully from offending in that particular way. A dumb race would sin far less than we do by blasphemy, perjury, lying and slander. On that account, the particular good effects of any law cannot be taken as warrant of its ethical soundness. But there are Catholics in the States who justify Prohibition on ethical grounds, and it is their attitude that we are asked to take into account as a reason for modifying our own view. That view, which we hold to be in thorough accord with Catholic principles, has often been stated in these pages: it is this: The State has a right to enact Prohibition only (1) when practically all the citizens want it or (2) when the abuse of strong drink is so habitual and prevalent and detrimental to civic well-being that it can only be remedied by abolition of the use. There are cases when it is the moral duty of the individual to forswear the use of intoxicants—when their use invariably leads him on to abuse: in such a case, total deprivation and other remedies are necessary to cure the vicious habit. Short of that an occasional lapse, however wrong, would not impose the obligation of total abstention. Now, we ask, is it possible for a whole people to get into that state? Are we to say that the vast majority of a nation numbering over a hundred millions, are so lax in moral fibre that they cannot be trusted not

to abuse, seriously and habitually, the opportunities of getting drink? There is a liquor-question in every nation, and every Government legislates from time to time to secure that the use of strong drink does not lead to excess—is the United States the only people in the civilized world unfitted to be trusted with the smallest opportunity of going wrong in this regard? It seems to us that American Prohibitionists, Catholics and others, do their country a grave injury in the eyes of the world in thus equivalently proclaiming its lower level of moral strength. Wise parents keep strong drink from their children as long as possible, wise Governments regulate severely its export to backward races under their control: the principle in both cases is the same: the temptation to excess may be too strong for undeveloped moral characters. Here we have the greatest nation in the Western world—the greatest in wealth and material civilization in the whole world,—treating its subjects as children have to be treated!

If the above implication is parried by the assertion that what is aimed at is not the reclamation of a people debauched by excess and incapable of being otherwise cured, but merely the removal, in the interests of social life, of a source of moral degradation and material inefficiency, this plea only makes the means adopted still less justifiable. For the principle could as logically be applied to every similar cause of waste and social detriment. The theatre, the "movies," the race-course, the luxury-trades, all cause enormous and unprofitable expenditure, and are all associated with immorality. Where are such sumptuary laws to stop, once the State has sanctioned the principle of total suppression? Think of the aggregate fortunes that go up in smoke through the unnecessary consumption of tobacco! Abuse of a thing innocent in itself, when not universal and extreme, may and should be corrected by regulation and control, not by entire prohibition; moreover it is certain that in proportion as conscience loses its power of guidance and restraint in any community, external law must be framed to take its place. On this showing Prohibition would indicate the all but total ineffectiveness of conscience amongst the American people! It is true, also, that, though in St. Paul's phrase, "the law is not made for the just man," since he does what is right at the dictation of conscience, still, living amongst the less just, he must put up with many restrictions on a liberty which he would not abuse, because others are not so conscientious. That is why, in this and other countries, he has to endure many vexatious regulations, which in his case are not necessary but without which excess of all kinds would break out around him. The public order, thus created and secured, is his compensation for the multiplied interferences with his freedom. But when it is proposed to deprive him of freedom altogether in one particular direction, he has a right to ask whether

the result purchased by his sacrifice could not have been obtained, as it is in many countries, at less cost. The advocates of Prohibition in America have never even tried the methods which in other countries have kept the Liquor Traffic under effective control. And therefore the American "just man" has a real grievance against the Eighteenth Amendment, even were it as complete a success as it is completely a failure. It is not a just, because it is an excessive, interference with his liberty. It cannot be justified, except on the supposition which we have rejected, that it was necessary as the only means of protecting the American people from grave moral and material injury. That is not to say that it may be rightly violated: its observance does not involve violation of any moral obligation, and the danger of weakening regard for all law by openly flouting it is a real one: so charity towards one's neighbour calls for obedience, if under protest. But protest there should be, emphatic and continued, or else, so far from this particular invasion of liberty being repealed, it will surely pave the way to others.

It will help towards a consolidation of Catholic feeling and action in this matter to reflect that the Archbishops of Australia and New Zealand, headed by the Apostolic Delegate, published in October of last year an emphatic condemnation of Prohibition as a remedy for the evils of excessive drinking—the first official repudiation of the system on the part of the teaching Church. The state of the Drink Question in Australasia is much the same as it was in pre-Prohibition America and the Archbishops declare themselves "so much alive to the necessity of legal control of the drink traffic that we would regard with sympathy any sane proposal to buy out existing liquor interests and to vest them in some public authority." But they are conscious of a Manichean spirit in the advocacy of Prohibition, they resent the implication which its imposition would carry that their people as a whole are drink-sodden and incapable of self-control, they regard it as an unwarrantable infringement of the reasonable liberty of their fellow citizens, and they feel that its enforcement would produce more evil than it would remove. In the phrase "existing liquor interests" they touch the core of their problem. As long as the financial prosperity of a huge and powerful trade organization is bound up with the maintenance and spread of drinking habits, what is excessive in those habits will be nearly impossible to cure. If the Prohibitionists of the United States really want to know how the evils of the saloon can be abolished without abolishing the good which is liberty, they have the experience of Canada to enlighten them—Canada, which has tried Prohibition and which has reverted to the saner and more Christian method of State-control.

Elsewhere in this issue there is an able analysis of the voting in the late Presidential election which aims at showing that

religious bigotry had less influence than is claimed for it in defeating Governor Smith. His assertive "wetness" was seemingly more potent in depriving him of votes than his Catholic faith. Yet "wet" as he was, he received 15 million votes against the 21 million votes of the "dry" Mr. Hoover : that is, after nine years of experiment 41 per cent of the voters are still against Prohibition. We know the immense sums which have been spent in enforcing the law, the savage penalties attached to its violation :—it is surely plain that this particular enactment cannot claim, in any true sense, the consent of the governed. Yet our opposition to Prohibition is not finally based on its ill success. We maintain as Catholics that in itself it is a wrong means to a desirable end.

J. K.

VÉZELAY.

THE road winds up and up the steep hill on which the little old grey town of Vézelay is set, reminiscent of an Italian hill city; Vézelay, a name known over Europe in the Middle Ages, the shrine where St. Mary Magdalene was worshipped as nowhere else; Vézelay, the pulpit of St. Bernard, the gathering place of crusaders, the spot whence news would be carried over Europe, and so chosen by St. Thomas of Canterbury for his excommunication of Henry II. of England; now solitary and forgotten, though haunted even beyond other French cities by thronging, glowing memories of the past. And the great Abbey church, so glorious when Vézelay was a home of religion and meeting place of warriors; then at the Revolution left to crumble into ruins; now restored to its ancient grandeur. Bare though it is of the thronging crowds of pilgrims who once filled its walls, it still towers up, crowning the hill, splendidly pathetic in its loneliness, but alive and gazing out into the future. The old city is now little more than a village, but is still girt with the remnants of its ancient walls, and surrounded by a grass grown walk bordered with lime and walnut trees, from which we can look for miles over the country at our feet.

But it is not memories of past history alone that crowd upon us when we stand in the narthex of the Abbey Church, before those marvellous portals blazoned with the symbols of mediæval theology. Huysmans has shown us how the Cathedral of Chartres sets forth the whole Catholic interpretation of Christian doctrine as embodied in mediæval theology; every detail of colour in the windows, of beasts and birds and flowers in the sculptures, containing its mystical meaning, each figure possessing a symbolic interpretation; all marshalled into a glorious procession of adoration of the Redeemer, and homage to His Blessed Mother. And what is seen in the fullness of its perfection at Chartres is to be found in more or less degree at Vézelay and in all the other

twelfth and thirteenth century churches of Western Europe. Their structure, their accessories, their decoration are symbolical. Christ lies upon the cross—His head upon the altar, His arms upon the transepts, the doors of nave and transepts the symbols of His wounds. The nave and flanking aisles signify the Blessed Trinity, as do the three great West portals. The central door, divided by a pillar, has a statue or emblem of Our Lord, who says of Himself in the Gospel "I am the Door!" The division is a symbol of the two roads which men are free to follow, and in many churches the symbolism is heightened by the representation of the Last Judgment above the doorway. At Vézelay we have a subject not often represented—Our Lord imparting the gift of the Holy Spirit, symbolized by rays of light streaming from His hands on to the kneeling apostles.

The narthex, or ante-church, again is full of symbolism. It held the baptismal pool, it was the emblem of Purgatory, the passage to the New Jerusalem; through its doors the baptized and the absolved alone might pass. And so it afforded shelter to catechumens and penitents.

Hand in hand with symbolism went the actual translation of Scripture history into sculpture—the Bible in stone. So were the facts of Old and New Testament ever present to the mediæval mind. It is this witness to the teaching of the Church, often grotesque, but always holding real meaning, that forces itself upon us, as we wander among the pre-renaissance churches of Western Europe. "Yet," says Newman in his *Apologia*, "Holy Church, in her sacraments and her hierarchical appointments will remain, even unto the end of the world, after all but a symbol of those heavenly facts which fill eternity. Her mysteries are but the expression in human language of truths to which the human mind is unequal."

I have said that Vézelay is haunted by the past. As we stand in her silent streets or on that lime-scented path which skirts her ramparts, we almost hear the tramp of crusaders' feet and see the solemn processions as they filed into the great church. But of all the historic figures who have climbed Vézelay's steep and narrow streets, that of St. Bernard towers above Popes and Kings. For when the statesman is a saint, there are no limits to his powers, and Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, reformer of monastic orders, vanquisher of Abelard, counsellor of Popes and Kings, preacher of the Second Crusade, monk, ascetic, recluse, mystic, member of the severest order, eminent exemplar of humility and, to crown all, saint, combined in himself all the greatest qualities of his age. He visited Vézelay at the bidding of Pope and King only to inaugurate the crusade, but his name is for ever bound up with the city. We endeavour, standing alone in the silent square in front of the great church, to recapture that Easter of

1146, when all the roads converging upon Vézelay were thronged with churchmen, men-at-arms, all classes of the people, streaming in to hear his burning words, no church able to contain the crowds. Difficulties vanished, over-powering enthusiasm replaced indifference in the fire of his eloquence; the saint tore his robe to shreds to satisfy the outcry for the cross. "Villages and towns are emptied," he wrote a month later to Pope Eugenius III. "You will hardly find one man to seven women. There are widows everywhere whose husbands are yet alive." An immense hope inspired Christendom—the vanquishing of the infidel, the reclamation of the Holy Places. But the Crusade ended in disaster—the time had not yet come.

From this time onwards Vézelay was the gathering place of crusaders. Philip Augustus, Richard Cœur de Lion made their vows at the shrine of the Magdalene; St. Louis on his return from Palestine was present at the solemn veneration of her relics, to whom the town owes its basilica and its fame. Girard de Rousillon, Count of Provence, and his wife, Berthe, had founded a monastery of Benedictines in this wild Burgundian fastness in the ninth century, building the first abbey church, tradition tells us with their own hands, though aided by supernatural powers. And to it, the monk Badilon brought a portion of the relics of St. Mary Magdalene, discovered by him at Saint-Maximin, her burial place in Provence. It was known that they had been buried by the faithful to save them from destruction by Saracen invaders, but the actual spot had been lost. It was for them that the glorious basilica was built, through them that Vézelay became one of the famous sanctuaries of France, and the Magdalene the patroness of Crusaders.

The great church was worthy of its fame. On it the Romanesque craftsmen had lavished their utmost art, and as we see it now restored to its mediæval glory it awes us by its majesty. The great portals of the narthex open out into a vista of pillars and arches. The alternation of white and grey, almost green, stone in the arches, and in the beautiful string course, running through the whole building and decorating both arches and arcading, gives an unusual and singularly striking effect to the nave and aisles. Without it they might be cumbrous and top heavy; with it we are conscious only of harmony and grace. In contrast with the grand simplicity of this decorative scheme, the capitals of the pillars run riot, with infinite variety of subject, and exuberance of execution—symbolism carried to extremes, though the main lesson set forth—the horror of lust in all its forms,—befits a church dedicated to the greatest of all penitents. The choir is early pointed of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, as beautiful and austere as is the nave. The building throughout is a wonder and a joy.

Of the monastic buildings scarcely a trace remains. The very greatness of Vézelay brought about her downfall. Her Abbots

defied the spiritual over-lordship of Cluny, their mother-house, and disputed the temporal power with the Counts of Nevers. And when in 1279 at Saint-Maximin, Charles of Salerno uncovered the sarcophagus with the relics of the saint, thus reviving its ancient glory, pilgrims flocked again thither and the decline of Vézelay set in. The authenticity of the relics found by Badilon was questioned and after two centuries of varying fortunes, with a predominance of strife, the abbey was secularized and its rank lowered to that of a collegiate church. The Huguenots did not spare it. Masters of the town in 1568, they pillaged the church and monastery, burnt the relics of the saint and made a stable of the sanctuary.

From that time the history of both town and abbey is a record of misery and strife. True, the Catholic power returned, and successive abbots did their utmost to restore the ruined buildings, but the destruction had been too complete. The place became the shuttlecock of factions, its days of fame were over. The Revolution dealt the final blow. The abbey buildings were demolished, the canons expelled, the church closed and left to moulder in ruins. Vézelay seemingly was left to its fate.

But France was to repent her orgy of destruction. To-day the great church has risen again in all its old magnificence, although it stands almost solitary, waiting for the time when the Faith, slowly reviving in France, shall bring again streams of pilgrims to implore the intercession of her, who, next to His Blessed Mother, stood nearest to Our Lord. The devotion of its clergy is bearing fruit. The great Basilica has not been restored merely as an architectural monument; still it recalls to us the great realities of the Faith, which are as vital to us to-day as in past ages, on which Time leaves no mark. It will play its part in the religious revival of France, and we may well believe a future worthy of its glorious past is in store for it.

S. LIVEING.

THE CATACOMBS IN HOLLAND.

A FEW years ago a non-Catholic writer in a series of articles describing the Catacombs at Rome said that, whether the Catholic Church was right or wrong, the Catacombs proved undeniably that the early Christians had precisely the same Faith and Worship as Catholics have to-day. We need not go to Rome or indeed any further than the pleasant little Dutch town of Valkenburg, to verify this statement, for there we may find a singularly faithful reproduction of the principal part of the Roman Catacombs. Holland is usually regarded as a Protestant country, but the Province at Limburg, neighboured by Belgium and the Rhineland, has remained sturdily and actively loyal to the Faith.

When, therefore, a wealthy inhabitant of Valkenburg had the happy idea of making an exact reproduction, under the rocks of his estate, of some of the Catacombs, his project not only won the hearty approval of the then Pope, Pius X., and of ecclesiastics and scholars of many ranks and many nationalities, but it gained the warm support of his fellow-townsmen.

The resolve was made in 1909, and in the autumn of that year he, along with Fr. Hagen, C.S.S.R., a learned archæologist, set out to Rome, where they got into personal touch with the authorities in charge of the Catacombs and with their assistance took photographs and measurements. Within a year the work had proceeded so far at Valkenburg that it was possible to open the first part, reproductions of the Catacombs in Rome of St. Calixtus and St. Priscilla. For three years longer the work continued until, not only was all the available space used up, but all the Catacombs which lent themselves to reproduction were now to be seen and studied on this estate. The enormous extent of the Roman Catacombs prevents, of course, a reproduction of them all: moreover, some of them are not in a condition that would make it worth while reproducing them, as they contain nothing that helps the student of the subject as a whole. There is also another difference between the copies and the originals. This is that the former are all gathered together as closely as possible, while the originals occupy a large area round the city. Otherwise the reproduction is so perfect in every detail, that at the solemn opening Baron Kanzler, the Secretary of the Commission of Sacred Archæology at Rome, declared that "when one walks in the Catacombs of Valkenburg one gets the impression of being before the reality, of being on a visit to subterranean Rome." Certainly, it requires little effort of the imagination for those who have never had the privilege of visiting Rome to feel at every turn in these dark galleries, honeycombed with tombs, that they are actually in contact with the reality; that here we are treading on sacred ground; that here one is among the relics of the early Saints and martyrs; that here many of them did make that supreme offering, and were laid reverently to rest by their survivors and successors. The result is in the case of all a better appreciation of what the Faith implies and what sacrifices it may demand.

The hill under which the Catacombs are excavated is most delightful to the eye, and its approach makes a healthy and pleasant walk. The entrance, which is not at the foot of the hill but a little way up, is a reproduction of the entrance to the Catacomb of Damasus, a typical Roman gateway, with the chi-rho monogram and on each side the Greek letters, Alpha and Omega, recalling the divine declaration in the last chapter of the Apocalypse.

Armed with long tapers, some of them twisted curiously round sticks so that they may be held high above the head and reveal

the beauty and interest of the roofs and higher walls of the caves the parties of visitors are led by a guide, a priest-student or one of the curators of the Catacombs. At the Jesuit college just outside the village are several American priests who delight in explaining to their fellow-countrymen the historical significance of each point in the tour. For a tour it is, and even the rapid survey of the casual visitor takes some considerable time. In the summer when there are many parties of sightseers it is usual to make the entry, not by the Catacomb of Damasus but by the Flavian Gallery leading to the Catacomb of St. Domitilla, one of the largest and most interesting of all. In the so-called Crypt of Orpheus one sees very noticeably, what is observable in some other places in a less degree, the manner in which the early Christians used what had up to then been pagan symbols for the purpose of reminding themselves and of teaching others the meaning of the actions and similitudes of Our Lord. This practice had a double reason. First it made the tombs less noticeable to the pagan inspectors appointed by the persecuting authorities, who from time to time visited them to see that no Christian rites were performed, and secondly it presented what was already familiar to the converts but now in a new light and with a new meaning.

It would require far too much space to describe even the most important of the various catacombs which are reproduced here; nor would it be necessary, since the Roman originals are described in many books. One thing which may be mentioned as pointing to the practical, living Catholicity of those who are in charge of what is not only a great museum but an equally great work of devotion, is that on St. Cecilia's Day, November 22nd, every year Mass is said in the reproduction of her chapel, just as is done in the original at Rome.

We may mention as well that the iconography of the Catacombs, which is so useful a source of information about early Christianity, is very faithfully copied here. The wall-paintings are usually divided into six different groups, as follows :

1. Symbolic drawings, such for instance as the Bread and Fishes, the Lamb, the Dove with the Twig, etc. ;
2. Allegories or parables ;
3. Scenes from Bible history ;
4. Historical events in the life of the Church and of the Saints.
5. Liturgical pictures.
6. Sacred pictures of Our Lord and His Mother and the Saints.

These are, of course, spread over the whole of the Catacombs and belong to various periods, though, generally speaking, they are in that order of succession, for it was not until later on in the history of the Church that it was safe to describe anything in a directly and obviously Christian manner. The oldest representa-

tion of a baptism which is known to exist is reproduced at Valkenburg. The figures are the neophyte himself standing with naked feet in the water with the priest wearing a stole. There is also the earliest known picture of Our Lady, which dates, probably, from the beginning of the second century, that is only seventy or eighty years after Our Lord's Resurrection.

In the two museums attached to the Valkenburg Catacombs a large number of loose objects have been gathered, some of them coming from Rome and others discovered at various places in Holland. A considerable number of ancient lamps and other small objects from the Catacombs at Rome have been presented by the Commission of Sacred Archaeology. A Dutch engineer living in Rome has also given a collection of antiquities discovered by himself, Roman antiquities found at Heerlen and Goudsberg in the same district as Valkenburg. There are also several stone coffins dating from the second and fourth centuries on which are carved images of Christ and St. Peter. Some of the epitaphs on the tombs of which there are reproductions at Valkenburg are not only evidence of the prayers offered on behalf of the faithful departed and of the petitions presented to those whom the Church has declared to have been worthy to enter the immediate Presence of Our Lord, but are excellent examples of how we might ourselves vary the often conventional and almost meaningless epitaphs which appear on our tombstones.

Accordingly, in Catholic Holland some of the circumstances of early Christianity may be vividly realized, just as in the celebrated "Holy Land" near Nijmegen is portrayed much of the scenery which formed the background of Our Lord's life.<sup>1</sup> When we add that there is being erected, also near Valkenburg, an exact representation of the Lourdes Grotto, we have said enough to show the very living Faith of Catholic Holland.

HERBERT ANTCLIFFE.

#### CATHOLIC PACIFISM.

CATHOLICS as a whole seem still unaware of the full implications of their Faith in regard to the practice of war and, like the rest of the world, they have not yet realized that the scale and character of the late war have made the pursuit and advocacy of peace even more of a Christian duty than it was hitherto. Fr. Stratmann's book<sup>2</sup> comes opportunely to remind them that Catholic pacifism is not merely a political attitude, to be assumed or not according to taste or party affiliation, but is an integral part of their religious profession. If some Catholics are still to be found amongst the militarists, the Chauvinists, the advocates of

<sup>1</sup> For an account of this extensive and successful enterprise see "Palestine in Holland." *THE MONTH*, January, 1923, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> *The Church and War: a Catholic Study.* By Franziskus Stratmann, O.P. London. Sheed & Ward. Pp. xiii., 219. Price, 5s.

exclusive nationalism, that sad fact simply shows that they know not of what spirit they are. If they ridicule attempts made to organize the world against war, if they think that mighty armaments really make for peace, they show a lamentable ignorance of the first principles of this all-important question, as well as a culpable disregard of the teaching of their spiritual leaders. Perhaps their ignorance may be partly due to the rarity of such books as Fr. Stratmann's, but its chief cause is unhappily that which makes so many fall short of their profession in other directions—a failure to be Catholics all through because of a weak subservience to the spirit of the world that surrounds them. Catholics in non-Catholic countries are especially exposed to this danger, for their spiritual allegiance to the centre of Christendom makes them particularly exposed and sensitive to the charge of want of patriotism, the scope of which natural virtue they are accordingly disposed to exaggerate.

A profound study, not only of the nature, causes and consequences of war but also of God's purpose in Christendom, which war so constantly defeats, should help to correct this mistaken mentality, and "The Church and War" gives ample opportunity for such study. Fr. Stratmann is nothing if not thorough, and he begins with a dissertation on the Mystical Body of Christ, the status of redeemed mankind, which makes the actual process of war so utterly incongruous. The unity which is the result of Creation, indefinitely elevated and strengthened by the unity wrought by Redemption, which turns mere creatures into children of God, postulates love and peace rather than discord and ill-will. Catholics, belonging both to "body" and "soul" of the Church, professing a faith which transcends all distinctions of race or status, or culture or sex, should be foremost in cultivating harmonious relations with "foreigners." And before the exaggerated nationalism created by the disruption of Christendom, it was so. The Catholic Church made pre-Reformation Europe, speaking broadly, one large family which found a common Father in the Pope.

The author in the rest of the book describes the moral and material havoc which war creates in the Mystical Body, and how it paralyses, for a time, the greatest and most important work that has to be done on earth, the conversion of the heathen multitudes. A section is devoted to the "theology" of war, the few conditions which justify it, the many conditions which vitiate it, and he takes occasion to tighten up theological teaching which, in later days, has tended, he thinks, to depart from earlier and sounder doctrine. Thus, he rightly demands an absolutely clear title before war is waged in order to vindicate a claim, and equally rightly he will have nothing to do with so-called wars of conquest, of which St. Augustine said, "Magna bella, magna latrocinia." This Catholic theory happily is fairly familiar amongst us, elabor-

ated in such works as Fr. Plater's "Primer of Peace and War" and other C.S.G. publications. But Fr. Stratmann, writing since the Great War, is able to give wider scope and force to Catholic teaching. He points out that now for the first time in history it has become doubtful whether any cause, however righteous and important, can justify letting loose on the world—for the impossibility of isolating the effects and curbing the extent of war is part of his thesis—the horrors of modern warfare. The material evils, vast as they are, are negligible in comparison with the moral evils—wholesale murder, lying, robbery, debauchery of every description,—which inevitably accompany war as now conducted. For now the distinction between combatant and non-combatant has been swept away in practice; and also in theory, if we consider that, by a recent law, *all* adults in France are automatically enrolled for military service on the declaration of war. And as the limitations, which secured to some extent the lives and property of the "innocent," have disappeared, so there is no longer any control in regard to the quality of the weapons used. In the opinion of competent observers, a war on the scale of the last, representing the conflict of two incompatible ideals, will be waged, not on battlefields but in cities, not by fighting but by high explosives, dropped from the sky, and poison or disease impregnating air and food and water. The mere thought has made the nations rush together and vow to be rid of such an abomination, yet, because they will not heed the wise counsel of Pope Benedict, and *simultaneously* disarm, they still feel bound to continue to multiply in self-defence the engines of destruction. The timorous make all the rest cowardly, the unprincipled bring the others down to their own level. Religious bigotry prevents non-Catholic nations from realizing that the one Power on earth which has no temporal ambitions and which has subjects in every nation is pre-eminently well equipped to be the universal arbiter of peace. But if, humanly speaking, we cannot hope for a re-united Christendom, is it too much to expect that the Pope's advice will finally be taken and the nations find security in the fact that their rivals have abandoned the power, as well as the will, to attack them?

In his final chapters Fr. Stratmann enlarges on these considerations with much force. His outspoken condemnation of most of the wars of history—including somewhat indiscriminately the Crusades—and his summary account of the peace-movement within and outside the Church, his fearless analysis of the pseudo-patriotism which still characterizes many de-Christianized hearts, have made a deep impression in his own country. Sound on the one fact that war, not being intrinsically evil, is capable of justification, he differentiates Catholic teaching from the unreasoning sentimentalism and false interpretation of Scripture which vitiates much of the non-Catholic anti-war propaganda. If there is a

fault to be found in the book it is its needless length. It could be shortened and simplified and made even more clear. But, as it is, it furnishes a mine of material for the enlightenment and strengthening of the Church's work for Peace. If war is to continue, the blame is largely to be shared by the members of a worldwide spiritual family who make no effort to understand, appreciate and do good to those of the Household, or to inspire with Christian dispositions those outside. One of the benefits to be hoped from the reassembled Vatican Council will be the formulation of a Christian code of peace, so strongly advocated in many Papal Encyclicals, and clear condemnation of the various unrighteous causes of war which even Christians, ill-instructed or chauvinistic, are still found to support.

J.K.

---

## II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

Two  
Presidential  
Acts.

As a man of peace Mr. Hoover has been unfortunate in having, at the very outset of his Presidency, to do two things which are not much in accord with it, viz., to advocate a strong U.S.

Navy, and to take sides in the Mexican civil war. As regards the first, although his inaugural speech contained many hopeful and inspiring passages, "there was one sentence which showed, albeit somewhat obscurely, that he still shares with Mr. Coolidge the delusion that, in the long run and on the whole, armed might is a means to peace. "Peace," he said, "can be contributed to by respect for our ability in defence." That is not true in a world which has accepted the Kellogg Pact, and which contributes to peace, not by individual but by united effort. Statesmen are always trying to distinguish between defence forces and forces for attack, whereas, so far as they are mobile, the two are practically identical. A nation strongly armed for defence is also strongly armed for attack, and moreover, the needs of defence vary directly with the likelihood of attack. To aim at being formidable quite irrespective of the likelihood of aggression is alien to the new spirit of international intercourse which is founded on mutual trust, not on mutual fear. In a plain-spoken article called "Em-battled Good-Will," our American contemporary *The Commonweal* (Feb. 20, p. 446) exposes the real meaning of thus exhibiting "ability in defence." The nations, it is pointed out, debarred by the Washington Treaty from competing in tonnage and gun-power are competing in speed, a quality somehow overlooked at Washington yet of prime importance in naval affairs. America is determined to be in a position to enforce her view of sea-law in wartime: at any rate, she wants to have something to "bargain with"

in the next naval conference. The notion of "bargaining," as if colossal armaments were invaluable assets to be very reluctantly diminished, and not almost intolerable burdens created by fear, to be shed with profound relief once fear is banished, shows how slowly the conception of a new era, of which the renunciation of war is the happy expression, penetrates the official mind. Another instance. The British Naval Estimates show this year a slight decrease; immediately a noted advocate of economy, Mr. Geoffrey Drage, writes to *The Times* (Mar. 11) deprecating even this attempt at saving. Why? At the end of his letter he betrays his mind. Because Frederick the Great and other experts were convinced that war would never cease and said so, we must not put our trust to Geneva. "The British Fleet is the strongest guarantee of peace, not only for our commonwealth of nations, but also for the greater part of the world at large." It is the spirit that lies behind such utterances as these, the words of one too old to learn, that is reflected in the exertions of the "Big Navy" group in every country. Against this spirit the friends of Christian peace must constantly fight.

**The  
President and  
Mexico.**

If ever a people had a right, given a real probability of success, to overthrow a tyrannical and unconstitutional government, that right has been vested in the people of Mexico, at least for the last four years,—the period during which Calles and his successor have maintained themselves in power by political corruption and military force. We do not say that the present revolution is an exercise of that right, for the facts are too obscure; nor is the Catholic Church as such implicated, for the Pope long ago forbade armed resistance; but enough is known to produce the conviction that the actual government has never, legally or morally, had the right to rule in Mexico. Yet the new President of the United States has felt justified in sanctioning the export of arms and munitions into Mexico for the sole use of the *de facto* Government. Now there is no moral difference between supplying a belligerent with weapons and assisting him with troops. President Hoover has equivalently taken sides against the Mexican insurgents, without apparently pausing to consider whether their cause is just. We very much regret that he should have thus inaugurated his rule, possibly repeating in an opposite sense the mistake which President Wilson made in refusing to recognize President Huerta in 1913, and so prolonging the civil war of that day. The true character of the present Mexican Government has been sedulously kept from the American people, despite many endeavours to break the Press boycott, but it must be known to its rulers. No nation professing even a nominal Christianity could, with any self-respect, consent to maintain diplomatic rela-

tions with men of the character of Calles and Gil. Yet, whilst refusing diplomatic intercourse with the Russian Bolsheviks, the U.S. Government, through its Ambassador, continues hand in glove with their Mexican imitators. What wonder that European observers think that finance rather than justice governs American relations with Mexico? If President Hoover had preserved a strict neutrality, in a quarrel, after all, not his own, and forbidden his armament firms to trade with the Mexican Government, he would have better consulted his reputation for uprightness and prudence. As it is, he must shoulder the responsibility of having perpetuated, as far as in him lay, an anti-Christian "Terror," misnamed a Government, in a neighbouring friendly and Christian land.

**Treachery  
to  
The League.**

The nervous tension which the continuance of military preparations maintains in Europe found expression in an outburst of alarm in Germany and elsewhere, when a Dutch newspaper wantonly published a forged document, purporting to be a military convention between France, Belgium and England to attack Germany through Holland should occasion arise. The forgery was a clumsy one, soon and easily detected, but its importance lies in the fact that, for a time, it was widely believed that these prominent members of the League of Nations were not beyond committing this atrocious act of treachery to their League engagements. Not yet has post-war diplomacy succeeded in convincing the vanquished in the war that they can now count on fair and equal treatment. Injustice begets resentment and, for the past decade, the unwillingness of the Allies to pursue a consistent policy of peace and reconciliation has kept alive in Germany the spirit of militarism. Witness the unblushing appeal to future war made by General von Seeckt, late Head of Army Direction, in Königsberg (Mar. 5). "The aim of foreign policy must be to attain an army corresponding to the size and importance of the nation." This, of course, is a direct result of the slowness of the Powers to reduce their own forces. Again, "the aim of foreign policy might be the maintenance of peace, but, in spite of the Kellogg Pact, war still belonged to the means of national preservation"—the old militarism. The longer disarmament is delayed, the more vocal will be clamours of this kind. We who won the war are now doing much to lose the peace.

**Has  
the Peace been  
Lost?**

"How We Lost the Peace" is actually the title of a long appreciation of Mr. Churchill's "Aftermath," published in *The Observer* (Mar. 10) by Mr. J. L. Garvin. The book purports to give the inner history of the "four malign years from the Armistice to the fall of the Coalition Government," by one of the chief

political actors. Its value does not consist in its revelation of things hitherto unsuspected, but in the corroboration, detached, and almost cynical in its detachment, of the adverse criticisms passed on Allied action during that time by those whose Christianity had remained proof against the war-fever. It comes as a climax to a long series of similar revelations, the cumulative effect of which has been to deprive the organizers of peace of almost every vestige of real statesmanship. It was not altogether their fault: the task was enormous, calling for vision, firmness, enthusiasm, and personal force of character, and they were all little men, narrow and confused in outlook, and tired with prolonged exertion. "We stultified victory," says Mr. Garvin, summarizing the testimony of the book. "In nearly every direction we lost the best chances of peace. Under the Coalition we fell below ourselves somehow, as much as in the war we had risen above former examples. . . . How to remedy [the results] is still the problem of pressing weight in politics." It is not amiss now to recall that every remedial step taken since has been in the direction of Pope Benedict's counsel, given at the crisis of the war in August, 1917,—a fact which suggests that the final remedy will be found in a full realization of his programme. Universal disarmament to the limits required to keep domestic order; arbitration of international disputes,—therefore, a competent International Court; removal of all obstacles to the free intercourse of peoples,—in this sense, proclamation of the Freedom of the Seas; complete and reciprocal condonation of injuries, as a general principle, leaving room for special treatment of special cases (e.g., devastated Belgium)—such were the general heads of the Papal recommendations.

**Results of  
Rejecting Pope's  
Advice.**

The problem of armaments is still with us, perhaps the main cause of European unrest; and certainly the main source of delayed prosperity.

The International Court has been set up but still lacks American adhesion; happily that may soon be given. The Freedom of the Seas has, since private warfare has been abolished, ceased to be a problem, but economic barriers to free intercourse are still unhappily prevalent, a source of friction and of loss. Finally, as a result of refusing to remit war-debts and to assess reparations on a reasonable scale, post-war finances have everywhere been thrown into confusion, from which even now the best brains of Europe and America are labouring to extricate them. For it has paradoxically happened that the more Germany prospers, whilst making reparations in kind (since she cannot in gold) the more she injures the nations to which they are made. France has fought from the first in the interest of her own industrialists against reparations in kind. Great Britain has lost heavily in exports, especially coal, since Germany has had to supply her

former customers. It would, in fact, have been much better to have confined reparations to a comparatively small sum, and allow the resumption of normal trade relations. But, as Mr. Churchill's book shows, the desire of revenge, foolishly stimulated by politicians, took no stock of elementary economics, and in the end the victors have suffered as much as, or even more than, the vanquished. It would be a pity if the lesson were not finally learnt. Surely, as Mr. Garvin suggests, there continues to be something very wrong with European conditions when "Britain and France, members of the League of Nations, are still in this year of grace 1929, encamped on the native soil of Germany, another member of the League." The United States, reacting from President Wilson's arrogant commitments, stood aloof, while the Allies floundered from one mistake to another. Happily under President Hoover America is now disposed to take her proper share in ordering the world by joining the Permanent Court of International Justice, without making conditions which would vitiate its effect, and by continuing her efforts to reduce international armaments. The mistakes of the Versailles Treaties and subsequent Allied statesmanship were due to the unslaked passions of war: it should be possible, now that the fever has passed, to recognize and remedy them.

**The Question  
of  
Minorities.**

The main business which occupied the attention of the League Council during the March session was the question of securing justice to minorities. The Senator who represents Canada on the Council, Mr. Raoul Dandurand, proposed a standing commission to deal with complaints and adjust differences when they arise, instead of the present unsatisfactory method of reference to the Council. Herr Stresemann, also, raised the whole matter of minority rights. Nothing was settled, but the Council, after prolonged discussion, called for a full report on the two proposals to be presented at its June session. There are, as is well known, some twenty million people in Europe living under Governments of alien race. If those Governments were wise, those alien subjects of theirs would be protected in the development of their own culture and language and admitted to full citizenship; and if they in their turn were wise, they would show themselves perfectly loyal to the Governments under which they live, not allowing racial sentiment to interfere with their allegiance. Unfortunately in many cases loyalty is wanting on the part of the subjects, and fair treatment on the part of the Governments, each party justifying itself by the conduct of the other. As Senator Dandurand remarked at a former Council meeting—"It is the highest expression of civilization for a Government to make a minority forget it is a minority," whereas, in reality, many Governments, by proscrib-

ing national language and customs, never allow their minorities to forget their fate and keep alive in their hearts the spirit of irredentism. That is not the way in which to engender loyalty. Fairness and even generous treatment, however, do not always produce loyalty. Recent discussions in Parliament have concerned the interests of a class of people living in Southern Ireland and calling themselves "Irish Loyalists." It would be difficult to choose a more misleading term. Those people are citizens of the Irish Free State and are under no political or social disability there. Their allegiance is due to the Free State Government, and, in a wider sense, to the British Commonwealth of Nations to which that State belongs. By ignoring facts in favour of political preferences they are doing themselves no good, and not contributing their share to the stability and prosperity of the country of which they are members.

**The Growth  
of  
Bureaucracy.** The Clause in the de-Rating Bill, empowering the Minister to alter or suspend its application at his discretion—a clause of which it was said

in its defence that it was "common form" in all

modern Statutes,—illustrates the constant trend towards bureaucracy observable in Parliamentary government to-day. Legislation becomes more and more complex, whilst the first endeavour of an administration is to be efficient, to exercise the powers wherewith it is armed by law. But legislation is often short-sighted, unforeseen difficulties arise, the law may actually inflict injustice—what more reasonable than to commission the Minister in charge to modify, extend or suspend, the particular Act so as to obviate those unintended inconveniences? Yet such a commission would be virtually the same as the "suspending power" which, as claimed and exercised by the Stuarts, excites such indignation in your modern democrat: the same, or greater, for ministerial powers sought to-day include actual legislation! The alternative is some sort of standing committee of Parliament to supervise the working of new Acts and report on anomalies and inconsistencies—a process necessarily involving delay and doubt in administration and therefore not favourably regarded by the executive. One is surprised to find as advocates of this form of bureaucracy members of a party which makes opposition to Socialism a main feature of its policy, for government by bureaucrats—officials and experts—is precisely what advanced Socialists are hoping to substitute for the slow and less efficient method of Parliamentary control. It seems also from their point of view a singular lack of foresight not to realize how likely to be extended, given the opportunity, such discretionary powers are, by those who wish to change the Constitution in that direction. There is more danger to what is left of democracy in this country in these encroachments of the administrative functions of Govern-

ment upon the legislative than in the nostrums of the professed Socialists, which public opinion, once it sees their real character, will not stand for long.

\* A  
Confused Political  
Situation.

The approaching General Election, when for the first time women will form the majority of the electorate and when millions of young, and therefore inexperienced, voters will exercise the franchise, has as yet aroused no excitement in the country. The prophecy that Labour will obtain a majority over the two other parties is either not believed or is regarded with indifference. This indifference may be due to the general discredit into which Parliament has fallen, through its unrepresentative character and the refusal of the parties to audit their political funds, or to the wide-spread conviction that the British proletariat is radically so individualistic, so attached to the rights of property (even though it has none) that it will never consent to a Communistic regime. Only a fringe of the Labour movement is genuinely Socialistic in the continental sense, and that is because the movement here has never abandoned a certain belief in Christianity and Christian morals. Abroad, where the religious antithesis is clearly seen to be Catholicism or Atheism, and where Catholic doctrine is known to condemn Communism, the moving spirits of the proletariat are openly atheist and are not fettered in their views and projects by any regard for the moral law. Another reason for the general calmness is the knowledge that modern Governments cannot be carried on without the backing of finance: the Bank of England has more influence upon the prosperity of the country than has the British Treasury. Now, one cannot expect finance to support any unjust attack upon property which is its own foundation. If the banks directly or indirectly refuse co-operation in any Government project affecting ownership, it cannot succeed. The unexpected moderation of the Labour Ministry during its nine months of office was due no doubt to the permanent officials and to the fact that it was in a Parliamentary minority, but also to this modern feature of political life,—the grip the machinery of capitalism has upon the functions of government.

The Vote  
to be used  
Conscientiously.

Accordingly, the country does not seem to be alarmed at the prospect of a Labour Government in power as well as in office. If there had been a real belief in the doctrines of Socialism amongst the people at large, a Labour Ministry would long ago have been in supreme power and have experimented, to our detriment, in Socialist theories,—not, however, for long, since the collapse of credit would have soon ended it. The message from

Russia, framed in the blood and tears of that hapless people, has not been lost on the world. But the absence of any likelihood of revolution should not encourage apathy in the electorate. The vote like every other citizen right, should be used, or, for that matter not used, conscientiously. Ignorance of the truth in political matters may excuse from voting, for accurate knowledge is not within reach of all, nor is the leisure to acquire it; and the programmes of the several parties are too vague to be the basis of choice. But occasionally there is a clear issue, such as the claim of every child to religious education or the putting down of race suicide, or the iniquity of total divorce, or the spread of evil literature, or the right to private ownership, which may put upon the voter the duty of using the franchise. A vote on the right side is a blow struck for morality, which everyone is bound to uphold. And, however uncertain political and economic issues may be, no Catholic can doubt on which side of a moral question truth and justice lie.

**Three Parties  
an  
Abnormality.**

The three party system with the inevitable possibility of minority representation has again aroused criticism of our franchise system. The natural remedy—proportional representation,

which at least secures that every vote should have its due effect—is instinctively shunned as tending to the multiplication of parties and the consequent instability of Governments. We have yet to see any recognition on the part of responsible politicians that there is no basis in British politics for more than two parties. The Labour party came into being because the leaders of the other two had not sufficiently looked after the interests of the great bulk of the population—the workers and their dependants. In other words, its *raison d'être* was economic, not political: it represented the wage-earning class of the population,—a horizontal division, whereas the cleavage between political parties is vertical. It may be that the adoption of the Labour "ticket" by men of the aristocracy and the middle class, which is becoming so noticeable, is an unconscious recognition of this fact; an endeavour to undo the mistaken policies which provoked the formation of the Labour Party. In fact, the ideal way in which to repair that disastrous oversight, and to prevent the class division in politics on which the Communists rely for their success, would seem to be a general migration of the Liberals to the Labour camp, but, since politics is largely a conflict of personalities, that solution is not likely to be adopted. All that the conscientious voter can do in the circumstances is to ascertain as far as possible which of the candidates is most likely to promote the common good, which means, essentially, the maintenance and inculcation of Christian morality.

Non-Catholic  
Youth and  
the Bible.

Recent correspondence in the Press shows that non-Catholic youth is being left very largely in ignorance of the contents of the Bible, although non-Catholic Christianity takes the Bible as the sole and sufficient rule of faith. A writer in the *Times Educational Supplement* (Feb. 15) gives an appalling picture, both of previous inadequacy and present neglect, in Bible-teaching. In non-Catholic schools the Protestant Archbishop Ussher's chronology ("B.C. 4004, Creation of Adam," etc.) is assumed to be true, and no attempt is made to explain the exact historicity of Genesis. The Catholic system of at first using Bible histories instead of the actual text is calculated to furnish a much sounder knowledge of God's ways with man as related in Scripture, for Catholic tradition and the guidance of the Church saves the youthful mind from an unscientific and blind fundamentalism on the one hand, and on the other from the universal bewilderment and doubt, which is the natural effect of modernist higher criticism. The writer in question is all for the latter; he casts scorn upon the unenlightened teaching that identifies "the God of the Pentateuch, the God of David, the God of Amos, the God of the Jews of the beginning of the Christian era, and the God of Christianity," and assumes true history in the Book "from the time of Moses onwards." His remedy is worse than the disease: he would have everything held as doubtful till historic criticism has made it certain! He would hand over the most difficult literature in the world, dealing with man's origin and early history, and with his relations with his Creator, and expressed in a variety of literary forms in an archaic language, to the discussions of the school-room! We are all for intelligent Bible teaching, and we are as averse, as is the writer, from the crude and obscurantist fundamentalism which he derides, but surely there is a medium between that and looking on the Scriptures as "a source-book for comparative religious study," or as a mine of folk-lore to be explored and investigated, without any prior fixed beliefs or certain religious guidance. He divides most non-Catholic youths into "the type which has been brought up to believe in the Bible without thinking, and the type which has been brought up to disbelieve in the Bible, equally without thinking about it"—a sad revelation of the state of Scripture teaching outside the Church. What measure of faith in revelation will be left to either type, when everything scriptural, both in form and substance, is thrown into the crucible of doubt and pounded into a mess by the pestles of the higher critics as a preliminary to extracting from it something solid and stable and symmetrical?

**The British  
and Foreign  
Bible Society.**

The misuse of the Bible, which began when the "Reformers" endowed it with an unnatural ultimate authority the better to get rid of the divine authority of the Church, is perpetuated

in that venerable Protestant institution, "The British and Foreign Bible Society" which celebrated its 125th birthday on the 7th of last month. Nothing better illustrates the criticism of *The Times* writer quoted above that Protestants are taught to accept the Bible "without thinking." There is much reverence for the Word of God in the account of the Society, written for *The Times* (March 7) by one of its officials, but little thought, and as little in the grave "leader" wherein *The Times* ruminates upon its history. For neither of the writers faces the fundamental objection that the means adopted by the Society for the spread of Christianity—"the circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular without note or comment"—is as likely as not to defeat its purpose. Even if every one of the 614 different versions, which form the Society's boast to-day, faithfully represented the originals,<sup>1</sup> surely the fact that making the Bible the sole rule of faith has resulted in the multitudinous sects of non-Catholic Christendom, should have finally dispelled the illusion that the sacred records are self-explanatory, or are interpreted correctly by the Holy Spirit in the heart of each reader. More than any other collection of ancient documents, the Bible needs, to make it rightly understood, all the notes and comments that full and exact scholarship can provide, and needs, moreover, since scholarship alone can rarely arrive at certainty, some accredited authority to settle disputed meanings. Persistence in the belief that the mere dissemination of translations of the Bible is an adequate means of evangelizing the heathen, in spite of intrinsic and extrinsic evidence to the contrary, is indeed a proof of the unthinking and even superstitious adherence to the old Protestant tradition of the "open" Bible. "The Englishman is puzzled," said that detached observer, Disraeli, of the B. and F.B.S., "but still subscribes." And so, since the Englishman is too indolent to resolve his doubts, the B. and F.B.S. goes on. It has distributed, we are told, 396 million volumes of complete Bibles or complete parts in the course of its existence, and the yearly total is continually increasing; no attempt, unfortunately, is made to estimate even roughly the result. The Englishman remains puzzled. Meanwhile at home we hear frequent laments that reading the Bible is no longer an English practice,

<sup>1</sup> We recall the fate of that beautiful line, "Rock of Ages, cleft for me," which, retranslated literally from some native version, appeared as "Very Old Stone, separated on my behalf." Marshall, in his "Christian Missions," gives many examples of faulty translations, and the misuse of the Bible thus misrendered, though we are willing to believe that the scholarship of the Society has improved since his time—1862.

—naturally enough, since English youth are invited to criticize it freely and fearlessly, in the wake of the modernists who have long ago abandoned belief in its inspiration and inerrancy.

Canon Peter  
Green and  
the Virgin Birth.

After the Bible, the creeds. A prominent Anglican dignitary in Manchester, obsessed by the notion that many university students are longing "to enrol themselves as disciples of the Lord," if only the doctrine of the Virgin Birth did not stand in the way, declares his sympathy with their attitude<sup>1</sup> and makes them a present of the doctrine. "I don't wonder," he is reported to have said, "for I don't see how anyone can believe it, expressed as it very often is." We cannot guess the meaning of the latter qualification, and the speaker's analogy of a laurel-bush suddenly "for no apparent reason" producing a pineapple, is so off the point that we can only charitably suppose him misreported. He declares himself an "intense believer" in the mystery; which makes his attitude still more puzzling. There is surely only one way of expressing the fact that Christ Our Lord was born of a virgin, and that is by declaring that His Mother, in conceiving and bearing Him, did not lose her maidenhood. If Canon Green's young intellectuals cannot accept a miracle of that magnitude, which concerns the mode of the Incarnation, how can they accept the vastly greater miracle of the Incarnation itself, the union of infinite Divinity and finite humanity in one Person? Perhaps the Canon would not press them too hard. We remember a saying of his which shows that he worships the fog with the best of them. He once wrote<sup>2</sup>—the words are delightfully Anglican—"The glory of the Church of England is that it requires you to believe the great historic facts of the Christian religion, but as to the interpretations of them and the doctrines in which we formulate what these facts teach, the Church is very very sparing." Which is as much as to say: "Here is the creed of the English Church but she will not (or cannot) tell you what it means." Under the Canon's guidance, therefore, these earnest university students need not hesitate to declare themselves Anglicans. His "broadmindedness" extends beyond the Virgin Birth, for in the same sermon he declares that he, for one, would not be content with a Church which did not embrace Bishop Hensley Henson, Bishop Frank Weston and Bishop Knox. Considering the contradictory tenets put forward by these prelates, all teachers in the same "Church," the range of doctrine offered to the students for rejection would be quite large.

<sup>1</sup> Sermon at Liverpool, March 6.

<sup>2</sup> *The Church Times*, April 14, 1924.

**The  
Magnanimity of the  
Pope's Action.**

The reaction of the non-Catholic world to Italy's recognition of the Papal monarchy has been surprisingly moderate. The manifest purpose of the Holy Father to reduce his territorial possessions to the very minimum has taken the wind out of the sails of those who were prepared with the old accusation that the Papacy aims at the civil domination of the world. The Pope has made clear that the restoration of ecclesiastical liberty to the Church in Italy has been much more his concern than the vindication of his own rights.<sup>1</sup> He has carefully avoided giving any cause for fear or suspicion to those to whom now the territorial integrity of Italy is a fundamental principle, abandoning with a magnificent gesture of renunciation the age-long rights of his See and Office to the States of the Church,—those far-spread possessions, filched from his predecessors by one of those "mortal sins" of international politics which, like the partition of Poland, combined to bring upon a heedless world the penalty of the Great War. The greatness of that gesture is not lessened by the fact that, humanly speaking, the full restoration of the Papal States had become impossible. It might have come finally, if Providence so willed, and the Papacy, being eternal, is used to waiting on Providence. However, now that the object of temporal dominion—spiritual independence—is seen to be attainable, whatever be the dominion's size, the Pope has given a fine example of disinterestedness in thus waiving his just rights. Only those continue to carp who think that the Holy Father by these negotiations has given his Apostolic benediction to a political system which they detest—Fascism,—whereas by resuming the exercise of his sovereignty he has, if anything, withdrawn himself from its influence. We have yet to learn that the City of the Vatican will be administered on Fascist principles. At the same time Catholics, and indeed all decent people, have a right to protest against the action of the Editor of the *Review of Reviews* (March) in reprinting in his paper certain blasphemous cartoons relating to the Settlement from atheist Continental journals. His own biased comment is otherwise negligible.

**Opposition to  
Catholic  
Emancipation.**

Interesting side-lights on the nature of the contemporary opposition to Catholic Emancipation are afforded by occasional extracts printed by *The Times* and other long-lived papers from their columns a hundred years ago. The Orange Society in Ireland

<sup>1</sup> His two declarations of his mind and purpose have been translated and published, with appropriate notes and illustrations, by the C.T.S.—"How the Roman Question was Settled." Price, 2d.

—inveterate foe of the Catholic religion—attempted, apparently, to bribe the London Press, and *The Times* (Feb. 20, 1829) is very properly indignant

Will the public be surprised? No; the respectable British public will not be surprised when we inform them that circular letters have been forwarded from the General Brunswick Club in Dublin to all the provincial clubs in that kingdom, calling in the most urgent terms for supplies of money “*to fee the London Press*”; and the sum of *two thousand pounds* was actually remitted to London for that purpose on Saturday, the 7th instant. What are we to say of villains so base as this (and we believe they come from Ireland, too, some of them), who thus rant, and send forth their daily and weekly venom for pay? . . . Hence the opposition, such as it is, to the grand measure now in preparation—a dark, and obscure, and unavailing opposition, except that it avails those who carry it on; for no part of the intelligent press of London is against the removal of the disabilities under which Catholics labour.

A later issue publishes a letter describing the incredible ignorance of the nature of the Act, clouding the minds of the lower-class Protestant, as well as the frauds to which opponents sank. It is dated March 3, 1829:

Sir,—The enemies of Catholic emancipation may boast of the numbers, but not of the sense of their petitioners. Two old women, on signing the petition against concession, in Shoreditch, burst into tears. A friend of mine asked the reason of their distress: they said that they had each sons, who were religious young men, and who would assuredly be burnt, were the Catholics admitted to power. A boy in my employ boasts of having signed the petition four times. A friend of mine watched two boys, who put signatures to the petitions—one to the Commons, and one to the Lords—incessantly for a quarter of an hour. [A.B.]

Very aptly have the Hierarchy in their Joint Lenten Pastoral noted that the Catholic Relief Act emancipated Protestants as well—from the stigma attaching to bigots and persecutors and, as an article in the current issue makes clear—from the ignorance from which bigotry and hatred spring.

**The Fight  
against  
Pornography.**

There are many who think that because the Home Secretary is “virtuous” he is bent on depriving them of their legitimate “cakes and ale.” Whenever he suppresses a bad book,—and would that he were even more active in that regard!—he is pilloried as an enemy of freedom and light: whenever he utters

a moral truism, he is accused of an attack upon progress. He suffers in fact from being a Christian legislating for a society some members of which—the more vocal ones, represented by libertine authors and freethinking reviews—have long ago ceased to recognize the restraints of Christian morality,—morality which, after all, is not arbitrary and dependent on revelation, but is imprinted in the heart and conscience of man by his Creator. If a Christian bishop in Pagan Rome had called for the observance of decency in art, in the drama, in literature, he would have excited in the *literati* of his time the same angry derision that is aroused by Sir W. Joynson-Hicks. Yet who can doubt that, were the Home Secretary and those under him to cease their activities, the country would be flooded with filth, not only of the "commercial" sort but the "literary" kind as well. The "emancipated" seem to think that when literary grace, wit, humour and observation are employed to garnish a foul theme, it becomes somehow innoxious, whereas the truth is that these qualities are themselves degraded and polluted by the medium in which they work, and the result made doubly dangerous. We have noticed, for instance, in the introduction to a projected edition of Rabelais that the writer attempts to condone his grossness by the usual device of "question-begging appellatives." That dirty-minded apostate, in whom the priesthood was so unutterably degraded, and who, the writer owns, considered "the ascetic ideal itself [that is, the code of morality which Our Lord established] as the enemy," is excused in this sorry fashion—"his grossness is frank, naïve, rustic, joyous, natural"—as if those qualities made it any the less obscene. This is no true literary criticism, for it lays more stress on the form than on the substance, whilst it utterly neglects the standard of truth and beauty set by the Christian revelation. Yet it is all the guidance that one can expect to-day from the secular press. We have to fall back, in the absence of a Christian conscience amongst authors, on the police. The Home Secretary in a much-criticized remark to the effect that, whatever was the case in the past, nowadays a man cannot do as he likes with his own, was wrong only in implying that there was ever a time when that selfish liberty belonged to man living in community. "Nemo sibi vivit" is an aphorism as old as civilization. Not our likings but the law, human and divine, under which we live is the proper norm of our conduct, our speech and our writing.

THE EDITOR.

## III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest]

## CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

**Cosmos**, Catholic Teaching on the [W. J. Lonergan, S.J., in *America*, March 2, 1929, p.496].

**Fasting** in the Early Church [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Month*, April 1929, p.289].

**Mass**: the Doctrine of Scotus [P. Hubert Klug in *Estudis Franciscans*, Dec. 1928, p.381].

**Paradise**, Patristic teaching about [E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., in *Month*, April 1929, p.331].

**Suarez** on the International Society [J. Larequi in *Razon y Fé*, March 10, 1929, p.385].

## CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

**Bigotry** not the determining factor of Presidential Election in U.S.A. [J. Elliot Ross, C.S.P., in *Month*, April 1929, p.313].

**Conversions** resulting from Bigotry [G. Barton in *America*, Feb. 16, 1929, p.453].

**Coulton's**, Mr., Anti-Catholic Mentality [H. Belloc in *Universe*, March 8, 1929, p.9].

**Interdenominational** Conferences as a means of allaying bigotry [J. Elliot Ross, C.S.P., in *Commonweal*, Feb. 20, 1929, p.448].

**Reformation**, How resisted in England [H. Somerville in *Catholic Times*, March 8, 1929, p.14: Social Calamities due to: *ibid.*, March 15, 1929, p.11].

**Youth**, Undisciplined Cult of Liberty amongst [R. C. McGoldrick in *America*, Feb. 16, 1929, p.451].

## POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

**Animal Calculators**, the result of training [L. Roure in *Etudes*, Feb. 20, 1929, p.469].

**Batifol**, Life and Character of Mgr. [Documentation Catholique: article by Père J. Lebreton, March 2, 1929, p.515].

**Catholicism** in England: Statistics of Growth [*Southwark Record*, March, 1929, p.64].

**Christianity**: miraculous growth of Early [L. K. Patterson in *Stella Maris*, March, 1929, p.89].

**Co-education**, etc., against Catholic tradition [Documentation Catholique, March 2, 1929, p.540: *Fortnightly Review* (St. Louis), Feb. 15, 1929, p.66].

**Education**, The Law as regards Elementary Schools [P. M. Bell in *Catholic Times*, March 15, 1929, p.14].

**Jubilee**, The Extraordinary: Notes on nature, conditions, etc. [Rev. J. Kinane in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March, 1929, p.289].

**Reparations** and Peace [John Carter in *Commonweal*, March 6, 1929, p.504].

**Roman Question**: historical review of its nature and solution [*Civiltà Cattolica*, March 2, 1929, p.451].

# REVIEWS

## I.—WITNESS TO THE PAPACY<sup>1</sup>

THE series in which this volume finds a place is intended to provide a means whereby contact may be maintained with the original sources from which our knowledge of the past is derived. Two topics are discussed—the Petrine tradition, and the growth in importance of the See of Peter. The method employed is to provide an English translation of the various texts and a running commentary. The book makes no claim to be the result of original research. The translations are readable and it would be hard to mention any texts of value which have not been utilized so that as a mere collection of texts the book will be of great value to those who cannot consult a fairly well-equipped library. It is all to the good that these texts should thus be made easily accessible and so familiarize the student with the documentary substratum of the main positions of Catholicity.

But the book is more than a collection of texts: it aims at interpreting and criticizing those translated. And with some of the interpretations put on these documents, either explicitly or by implication, we must decidedly express our disagreement. We cannot develop this criticism at any length. But we make two remarks of a fundamental character. In the first place, the writers are the victims of a very common misconception as to the nature of the Petrine doctrine. They write "With reference to the Petrine doctrine, however, the Catholic attitude is much more than a 'pre-disposition to believe.'" That doctrine is the fundamental basis of the whole papal structure. It may be summed up in three main claims. They are: first, that Peter was appointed by Christ to be . . . head of His Church; second, that Peter went to Rome and founded the bishopric there; third, that his successors succeeded to his prerogatives, and to all the authority implied thereby" (p. xxiii.). The common misconception to which we have referred is contained in the second claim. It is false to say that the papal structure rests on this claim. The essential points are contained in the first claim, *viz.*, the appointment of Peter as head of the Church, and in the third claim, *viz.*, that the prerogatives of Peter, consequent on such appointment, are now enjoyed by his successors (who are, in fact, the Bishops of Rome). That Peter himself was at Rome, that Peter himself was Bishop at Rome or elsewhere, is not an essential element in the Catholic

<sup>1</sup> *The See of Peter.* By James T. Shotwell, Ph.D., LL.D., and Louise Ropes Loomis, Ph.D. London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. xxvi. + 737. \$10.00. 50s.

position. That *de facto*, *i.e.*, historically, Peter was Bishop of Rome is certain, and is universally taught by Catholic scholars. That *de jure*, and necessarily, Peter must have been Bishop of Rome in order that the present Bishop of Rome should be his successor as head of the Church, is not Catholic doctrine. Once granted the fact of the appointment of Peter as head of the Church, the only question at issue can be the transmission of that position to his successors. Even were it proved that Peter had never been at Rome, and had never been a Bishop, the question of that transmission would be unaffected. It would have made no difference to the papal prerogatives, if Peter without ever having been Bishop of Rome himself, had simply laid it down that his powers, as head of the Church, were after him to be held by the holders of the See of Rome. And, on the other hand, if it be proved from the historical documents that Peter was in fact Bishop of Rome, it would in no way necessarily follow that his successors in that See are also his successors in his position as head of the Church. Succession in the primacy is something quite different from succession in the See of Rome. Historically, and in fact, the former is annexed to the latter; but this is *de facto*, not necessarily *de jure*.

Our second criticism concerns the manner in which the writers deal with the main Scriptural argument for Peter's appointment as head of the Church. Despite a somewhat dis-ingenuous refusal to enter into the field of textual criticism, we are presented with a treatment of the famous Petrine text in St. Matthew, chapter 16, which cannot be called anything but textual criticism at its worst. Instead of accepting the Gospel as it is now printed in all critical editions (with only very slight variations), a theory of its origin is propounded which would entirely rob it of its historical value; and, in particular, the Petrine text is all but definitely proclaimed to be the result of the fashioning process of a faction at Antioch in its struggle with the Jerusalem party. The old story of the Logia and "Q" is dished up again, and finally the Gospel (which is later, obviously, than Mark, in this view) is said to be "the result of a longer process of development, which was perhaps only completed by the end of the first century" (p. 18). And it is further stated that the Petrine text is one which is not to be found in the Marcan source, or in "Q." "It is of decided historical interest that it is among these *extra* texts that those are found upon which the Petrine claims rest fundamentally. No inferences are here suggested beyond the statement of the results of textual criticism." (*Ibid.*) And again ". . . The story of his [Peter's] life with the Master . . . might easily have been interpreted or retouched . . . so as to bring out in better perspective the career and work of Peter as locally understood. This would not involve a conscious or deliberate rewriting of history. It would merely call for a change in coloring and the addition of

some details necessary to make Peter conspicuous for good and finally the appointed head of the new Church, the Rock on which it was founded." (p. 20.) We have given these extended quotations to show the kind of theory which lies behind this apparently neutral collection of texts. Under the circumstances we can only express our regret that the writers had not contented themselves with setting out the documents and allowing them to speak for themselves.

R.H.

## 2—MODERN MISSIONARY LITERATURE<sup>1</sup>

THE chance presentation of these three volumes for review summarizes the work of the Missionary Orders in three very important details. Would you seek the hazards of apostolic enterprise among the pioneers? Mgr. Raucaz at once brings us in touch with the cannibals and head-hunters of the Solomon Islands. Massacre, treachery, savagery of every kind was the lot of the Marist Fathers and Brothers at their first essay in the middle of last century. The Islands which they watered with their blood and fatigue were not yet ripe for Christianity in 1845; but these dauntless Fathers came again in 1897, to a people just as barbarous, but on whom the activities of grace were just beginning to tell. Amid poverty and doubt, dangers from sea and reef and malarial swamp, they have gallantly persevered, and now the Vicar Apostolic can write in quite measured terms of the success and suffering which he and his associates have undergone in the conquest of souls. It is an inspiring book, full of most helpful illustrations and maps. The price has been kept far lower than the material deserves—for the author must reach the multitudes—and the finish of the printed page leaves something to be desired in consequence. No matter: if a dozen other Missions were written up in this way, the Catholic world would be the richer for first-hand information concerning the right wing of the Church's activities, and the Missioner, we feel sure, would be none the poorer.

Father Gavan Duffy introduces us to the next stage of Missionary life, as illustrated in the fully established Mission Stations which stretch from Mombasa to Lagos and the Gold Coast. Now Father Gavan Duffy is an Indian Missionary belonging to the Paris Foreign Missionary Society, which has no establishments in Africa; and one wants to know what he is doing on the Great Lakes and the Congo. He is at pains to tell us. Having an urgent call to go to New York, he decided to cross Africa, as being the shortest road,

<sup>1</sup> *L'Amé des Peuples à Evangeliser.* Museum Lessianum, Louvain, 1928, 15.00 fr. *Let's Go!* By Fr. T. Gavan Duffy. London: Sheed and Ward. Pp. 511. Price 10s. 6d. *The Savage South Solomons.* By Mgr. Raucaz, C.M. New York: S.P.G. Pp. 270. Price \$1.00.

and at the same time to seek and obtain first-hand information concerning the "Catechist System" which is being worked all along this line. Chance introduced him to a young American who was concerned industrially on the Western Coast, so they decided to make the journey by car. That they never had a puncture or the suggestion of engine-trouble may not at first sight appear "Missionary." In point of fact it was; all depended upon speed of transit, so that the greatest amount of time could be devoted to each Station, and a thorough examination instituted into this all-important branch of Missionary lore. Although Father Gavan Duffy does not summarize his findings, we should say, that the crying need of every Mission Station was more, and still more, native catechists, that schools for this class of apostolic labourer need to be vastly increased in number and efficiency if the Catholic Schools are to keep pace with the inflow of converts and the requirements of the Belgian and English Administration: that the Tamil of Southern India has much to learn from the Bantu races of Equatorial Africa, and that the Fathers engaged—though of many varied Congregations—are a body of men to thrill one's blood. The book is well illustrated, though somebody left something behind which rendered the best camera useless, and the travel-talk as well as the more serious material is uniformly attractive throughout. The author is a shade less fortunate in dealing with countries which he did not visit, Madagascar and the South; be that as it may; some young Missioner may be induced to say on reading the volume, "Let's go!"

If the "Congress" spirit is of the order of the day, in no department is it more necessary than in that of the Mission Field. Men engaged, solitary and distant, amid the hardships either of the pioneer or the established Station, need encouragement, enlightenment, interchange of view, if the work is to be of the best. As there cannot ever be an *Œcuménical Council of Missionaries*, there can at least be associations of experienced men, who having lived the life, can speak with certain authority. Such a congress takes place annually at Louvain. This year the subject for discussion was "*L'Ame des peuples à évangéliser.*" Every speaker was an expert, and every Mission Field and well nigh every Congregation was represented on the agenda. Not all agreed as to the best way to treat the Black races, though Father Charles, S.J., demonstrated that the "Curse of Cham" does not lie at their door. Clearly the condition among the low-grade Mashonas of Rhodesia and the Kwango of the Lower Congo are widely diverse; but both classes of Missionary were the better for the saying of it. If Central Africa received a large share of attention—no more than it deserved—so the intense problem of the Mohammedans in and out of Africa was dealt with from the view point of the Apostle. Cardinal Lavigerie, with all his intrepid boldness, had counselled prudence; had the time come to throw caution to the winds and develop an

attack? Mohammedanism was rotten at the core but extremely active on its periphery; perhaps the case of the Uganda Martyrs and Father Charles de Foucauld had to be repeated before success could be obtained. But these were no foolish knight-errants; all talked soberly of "The Theology of the Khoran," "Ismael in Egypt and—Java," "Musselman Controversies." Each of these essays, apart from the spoken word, is in itself a most instructive document, and is followed by an equally frank and inspiring comment.

### 3—LEVITATION<sup>1</sup>

M. OLIVIER LEROY has earned the gratitude of all students of abnormal phenomena by a volume which must have cost him a great deal of research and which will undoubtedly prove of service to those engaged in the same line of investigation. Not least among the merits of his book is the fact that references are scrupulously given for every statement and so far as we have had opportunity of verifying them the references are accurate. For a book of this class, abounding in isolated details, this is to say much. Moreover, there is a full index of names of persons and a bibliographical list of the large number of works from which citations have been made. M. Leroy does not confine himself to the discussion of hagiographical sources alone. Although the most important and interesting of the cases of levitation with which he deals are those of canonized saints or holy people who have been raised from the ground when in ecstasy or at prayer, still he has also paid suitable attention to the alleged phenomena of the same kind which are recorded in the annals of magic, witchcraft and spiritualism. The main purpose of the whole enquiry is to give prominence to the strength of the evidence for this conspicuous interference with the great natural law of gravitation, in which matter, to quote the terms in which the author frames his main conclusion: "Catholic hagiography alone is in possession of an ancient written tradition, continuous and varied, based on verified and accurate documents, on levitation." Further he contends that: "Catholic hagiography, among doubtful or even seemingly interpolated facts, presents a number of cases where the evidence for levitation offers the security usually required from historical documents." Naturally we are very far from disputing these conclusions, but we are not quite sure that M. Leroy's arrangement of his evidence is such as will best bring home the strength of the case to the thoughtful critic. It seems to us that he has acted unwisely in mixing up examples of levitation which are evidently quite worthless with others that are well attested.

<sup>1</sup> *Levitation, an Examination of the Evidence and Explanations.* By Olivier Leroy. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. xiv, 276. Price, 10s. 6d. net.

Moreover we should be inclined to say that there are at least three instances of the former class for every one of the latter. We find it difficult to understand what good purpose can be served by quoting such obvious fictions as the reported flights of Christina Mirabilis, to take but one example, and there are, unfortunately, a good many stories of the same kind. It is true that the author warns us to be on our guard and that he sets out on p. 160 five "test formulas" by which the reader is to sift the evidence for himself. But that work of sifting seems to us to belong rather to the office of the writer of such a treatise. It is in fact much the most arduous part of the task he has undertaken.

#### 4—DR. GRABMANN ON ST. THOMAS<sup>1</sup>

**I**N this short, but remarkably full, work, Dr. Grabmann, a veteran authority on Mediæval Scholasticism, presents a masterly sketch of the career of St. Thomas, and an analysis of the leading ideas of his philosophy. The book is a model of scholarly compression, a model, too, of lucidity and sobriety. Nothing could be better than the way in which the intellectual history of the holy Doctor is traced in connection with the controversies which were at that time agitating the philosophical and theological schools—the Averroism of Siger of Brabant, the conflicts of seculars and regulars within the University of Paris, and the vehement opposition of the conservative, Augustinian school to what they regarded as the dangerous innovations of the Dominican Aristotelians. As is well known, an important section of the Paris University, and many even of St. Thomas' fellow-religious, especially in England, regarded his doctrine as verging dangerously in some points upon that Arabian Pantheism, which he had, in fact, triumphantly refuted. This story has often been told, and to readers of Père Mandonnet, M. Gilson, etc., there will be nothing new in Dr. Grabmann's narrative. But for those who are not already familiar with the history, Dr. Grabmann's pages provide a wholly admirable introduction.

The same may be said of the second part of the work, in which the Thomistic Synthesis is portrayed in outline. These chapters show that Dr. Grabmann is no mere historian of philosophy, but has an independent and penetrating appreciation of the fundamental concepts and doctrines of metaphysics. Only an accomplished scholastic philosopher could have written these chapters. And it is not merely metaphysical questions that are passed in review, but the ethical and political teaching of the

<sup>1</sup> *Thomas Aquinas. His Personality and Thought.* By Dr. Martin Grabmann of the University of Munich. Translated by Virgil Michel, O.S.B., Ph.D. London: Longmans. Pp. 191. Price, 10s. 6d. n.

Angelic Doctor is also described. The final chapter contains some pregnant suggestions as to the lines on which the scientific study of St. Thomas must hereafter proceed.

The translation is excellent. We noticed three misprints: Alexander VI. for Alexander IV. on page 4; and the name of Praepositivus is misspelt in the two places where it occurs. The binding and printing are very good, but the price is undoubtedly high for so short a work. Perhaps it is just that a book should be valued for its depth rather than its length; if so, the cost of this volume is well justified. A professional "book-maker" would have made a volume twice as large as this with one half the knowledge that Dr. Grabmann condenses into these brief pages.

### 5—PÈRE SURIN'S LETTERS<sup>1</sup>

NO one who has made acquaintance with the Abbé Bremond's "Histoire littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France" can fail to regret that he had not at his disposition the authentic and carefully edited text of the letters of Surin which is now being published by Père Cavallera. The second volume of this edition is now before us. It purports to deal with the correspondence of the years 1640-1659, but of letters properly speaking nothing survives which was written between 1639 and 1657. During the greater part of that time, Père Surin was out of his mind, or if one prefers so to regard it, was the victim of diabolical possession. The editor has in some measure supplied this lacuna by printing what he entitles Surin's "autobiography," and by himself contributing a collection of notes, arranged chronologically concerning the external facts of his life during these years of retirement. The "autobiography" consists of two sections of an account which the Father himself drew up in 1660 concerning the happenings at Loudun and his own spiritual experiences resulting out of this conflict with the powers of darkness. We should like to associate ourselves unhesitatingly with the regrets which Père Dudon has lately expressed in the *Etudes* that the modern editor has not printed the whole of the "Triomphe de l'Amour divin" and the "Science Expérimentale," instead of the two sections selected. To judge by the imperfect edition of 1830, of which we happen to possess a copy, the bulk of the treatise cannot be very considerable. In any case one feels that a knowledge of the strange experiences at Loudun is essential to an adequate appreciation of Father Surin's spirituality and the value of his counsel as a director of souls. The fact is not disputed that the Father in his distracted state attempted his own life by throwing himself out of a window

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres Spirituelles du Père Jean-Joseph Surin, S.J., par L. Michel and F. Cavallera, Vol. II., 1640-59. Toulouse, "Revue Ascétique et Mystique," pp. xvi—460.*

and that it must have been something of a miracle that he escaped with no more serious injury than a broken thigh. With Père Dudon we can see no sufficient reason for withholding the accurate text of a narrative already in large part published, and one moreover which is so intimately associated with the whole subsequent trend of his mind and his attitude to mystical problems. The letters in themselves are full of devotion and good sense, but except to the student of mystical theology they present no very notable features of interest.

### SHORT NOTICES.

#### THEOLOGICAL.

TWO papers by Père de la Taille, *De Sacrificio Vero et Proprio* and *Coena et Passio in Theologia Apologetica contra Pseudo-Reformatores* [Roma 1928] have recently come to our hands. They are reprints of articles published in *Gregorianum* last year, and contain further elucidations of the author's well-known theories against the friendly criticisms of M. Lepin. Père de la Taille's monumental work has occasioned quite a literature of pamphlets pro and con. He himself has written vigorously more than one *opusculum adversus murmurantes*. It is pleasant to note that the present argument is conducted in an atmosphere far removed from that of the old polemics. As usual, the author is ready with chapter and verse for most of his statements, and his collection of authorities gives even his controversial tractates an independent value.

#### BIBLICAL.

The Gospel parables have always been a favourite subject of study by the devout, for they contain such a wealth of meaning that there is always the chance of discovering in them some fresh gem of divine wisdom. Hence the abundance of commentaries, both old and modern, upon them. Amongst the latter an English version, made by Miss E. Leahy, of a work of Père M.-J. Ollivier, O.P., called *The Parables of Our Lord* (Browne and Nolan: 7s. 6d.), must take a high place. For the late Père Ollivier joined to a profound knowledge of the Scriptures, a practical first-hand acquaintance with conditions of life in Palestine which enables him to elucidate even the *nuances* of these consummate spiritual sketches, and show their bearing on the whole picture. The author classifies the parables chronologically and points out how their tone and object vary with the receptiveness of their audience. The force and beauty of the Gospel message are greatly enhanced with Père Ollivier as interpreter.

#### PHILOSOPHICAL.

The author of *Cosmology* (The Macmillan Co.: \$2.50), Father James A. McWilliams, S.J., has succeeded in reconciling two things which are, of their nature, not very easy to reconcile. He follows rigid scholastic "form" in his exposition and arguments, and yet he manages on the whole to avoid the aridity of style that generally follows from that method. The reader is thus carried pleasantly over the difficult places

of scholastic metaphysics—sometimes, it may be, without being permitted fully to realize the magnitude of the difficulties. Much allowance, of course, must be made for the very limited space at the author's disposal. It is really impossible to present these problems fairly in a volume of this size. But, granted that initial impossibility, it ought not to have been difficult so to treat the various questions as to stimulate further reflection in the reader's mind, and to avoid the suggestion that the arguments propounded are always final and unanswerable. This is, we think, the impression that an inexperienced student might derive from Father McWilliams' pages. But, with this caution, we can confidently recommend the work as containing, in brief compass, a good exposition and discussion of the philosophy of nature from the scholastic standpoint.

In discussing any system of philosophy the chief difficulty usually lies in its first definitions and axioms. There are systems in which, if we grant these at the outset, all the rest follows as rigidly as Euclid; instances are Spinoza and Descartes, and perhaps Aristotle, the model of them all. There are others which sit less lightly to their definitions; they seem to take them more as hypotheses, knowing that they are dealing often with the undefinable, and therefore at times letting themselves wander afield in speculation. Such is the school of Plato. Now when a philosophy of the first class comes to treat of the supernatural, either supernatural truths must be brought within the terms of its own definitions, or for the moment these definitions must be set aside and doubtful theories must take their place. This will explain what we find of good and of less good in *Ideas and Revelation*, by F. W. Kings-ton, B.D., (Heffer: 4s. 6d. n.). The author frankly accepts the definitions of Locke. He teaches that "Revelation has not ceased to-day"; and he is right in so far as revelation is defined in his own way, but it is not the definition given by Revealed Religion. Hence in discussing points of Revealed Religion, "articles of faith" as we call them, the effort to confine them, and explain them, within the confines of his original definitions, however laudable and however instructive, leaves much to be desired as a full account of revealed truths. There is much we apprehend which we cannot comprehend, and which no human system of philosophy can reach. All philosophy can do is to take us to the edge whence we leap the chasm; faith takes the leap and is not disappointed, but it leaps into a land where not its own ideas but God alone can guide. In contrast with this work we would put Newman's *Grammar of Assent*. At its close, it seems to us, there is some very loose thinking, as if the author had found the ocean of revealed truth too much for his philosophy.

#### DEVOTIONAL.

Père Grou never ceases to have a peculiar fascination for English readers. He formed a main link between continental Catholicism and Catholicism in England more than a century ago, at a time when the latter was coming back to life; perhaps that is the reason why, then and since, he had so great an influence on the Catholic revival. We therefore are glad that yet another of his works has appeared in an English dress: *Meditations on the Love of God*, translated by the Benedictine nuns of Teignmouth (Burns, Oates and Washbourne: 6s.).

The first French edition was published in London, in 1796. The book is arranged in the form of an Eight Days' Retreat, three meditations with a consideration for each day; the meditations are divided into points. The student of the Spiritual Exercises will recognize the way the ex-Jesuit has kept them in mind, and has used them to guide himself in his retreat, even while all the time he speaks of nothing but the Love of God. As a book of casual spiritual reading this volume may appear dry and abstract, but as a stimulant for thought and prayer it is excellent. It teems with sentences to be remembered.

A book to stir the zeal and enthusiasm of young clerical students is *Aux Séminaristes* (Téqui: 11.50 fr.), consisting of practical advice drawn from various parts of the writings of P. J. B. Aubry, by l'Abbé Augustin Aubry. The author is well known in France, as a theologian, as a missionary in China, and as a confessor for the Faith, and his style is full of a fire which corresponds with all three titles. The selection here made takes a student through all his seminary course, giving him counsel in his studies, in his spiritual life, and finally in his preparation for the priesthood. An excellent book for a seminarist's private spiritual reading.

Preachers who find it difficult to say anything new on Our Lady of Lourdes may be helped by *Symbolisme de l'Apparition de Lourdes*, by R. P. Jean Emmanuel Baragnon, O.P. (Téqui: 11.50 fr.). The preacher has certainly hit upon something original, and yet at the same time simple. He has studied the details of the apparitions, and out of each gesture of Our Lady has drawn matter for thought,—the joining of the hands, the smile, the sign of the cross, the use of the rosary, the bare feet with the roses, and finally the words Our Lady spoke. All is analysed with that eloquence and interjected prayer which are the ornament of the French pulpit.

The *Notes of Retreats* (B.O. and W.: 6s.), given by Father Bernard Vaughan, S.J., and taken down and selected by Caroline Lady Paget, suffer from an inevitable scrappiness but, dealing as they do with the fundamental things of the spiritual life, are full of practical wisdom and helpful suggestions. It was a happy thought thus to give the great orator and experienced director the means of continuing his mission after his death.

A selection from the devotional outbursts which mark a series of contemplations on the Passion, written by a holy Portuguese Augustinian when a prisoner in the hands of the Moors, has been published with the title *Prayers of Fra Thomas of Jesus* (B.O. and W.: 6d.). As Archbishop Goodier explains in an appreciative Preface, they have been arranged in an order roughly corresponding to the three stages of spiritual advance, and if at times they seem to transcend the individual's present aspirations, they can at least stimulate desire. Printed in detached sentences these "elevations," to use an old ascetical word, will be the more easily pondered and assimilated.

#### HISTORICAL.

The revision of estimates of the "Reformers," from Luther to our own time, is one of the hopeful signs in our generation that point towards reunion. To very few indeed is Luther now, as a man, a hero; the most that can be said for him is that he was the voice of his age,

and that, though variously understood, we can easily allow. But M. Jacques Maritain, in his very able book, **Three Reformers** (Sheed and Ward: 7s. 6d.), is not content with giving him and others a label; he goes beneath the surface and enquires what exactly are the "reforms" they have brought about. The result of his studies has been that almost all the false thinking of our time is to be traced back to three sources, three men each of whom laid down, and deceived the world by, a new false principle. Luther, by proclaiming the utter corruption of man, and thereby relying entirely on faith in Christ and His grace, practically destroyed all responsibility for sin committed: *peccata fortiter, credere fortius*. Descartes, by going to an opposite extreme, and analysing man as if he were an angel, virtually made man a God unto himself. Rousseau, the "Saint of Nature," so taught the worship of Nature as to destroy the power of the will to rise to higher things. So, crudely, we may summarize the excellent three parts of this closely-reasoned book. To an English reader, no doubt, the discussions on Luther and Rousseau will make most appeal; but we can well understand why the French mind will most realize the effect of Descartes. M. Maritain shows how Descartes has dominated French thought from his time till to-day. To follow the author further, or to discuss his points with him, would require a long essay. Let it suffice to say that we believe M. Maritain has written a book which will have a distinct effect for good amid the religious controversies of our time. Though this is nowhere said, we presume the volume before us is a translation. If so, then as a translation it is a model of good work.

Of a very different type, yet pointing to the same end, is **Erasmus the Reformer: A Study in Restatement**, by Leonard Elliott Binns, D.D. (Methuen: 5s.). The book contains the Hulsean Lectures delivered by the author in 1922, reprinted in a second edition. Frankly Dr. Binns, no less than Maritain, gives up Luther as impossible, though he surrenders him, less because of the mischief he wrought, more because of the violent and revolutionary methods by which he wrought it. As if in palliation, to save the face of Luther and his ways, he has much to say of the corruption within the Church; we almost feel as we read that the author's heart is not in what he says, but that, for the sake of appearances, he has to say it. In his treatment of Erasmus he is more at home, indeed, enthusiastic; his thesis being that Erasmus sought reform by amendment from within, not by revolution, and that we would do well in our time to follow his example. To which we can only reply: What is meant by "within"? Erasmus certainly meant, on the author's own showing, within the Church, Catholic and Roman, and nothing else.

#### SOCIOLOGICAL.

A book that helps us considerably to "see ourselves as others see us" is **L'Esprit public aux Etats-Unis après la Guerre**, by A. Lugan (Les Editions des Meilleurs Livres, Paris). The author is a brilliant Catholic journalist, whose many books on present-day subjects have won him a name for deep insight. In this volume he gives the results of his studies after a visit to America; first explaining the political parties that rule in the United States, and the reasons for the various alternations of opinion circling round such names as Wilson, Harding, and Coolidge. Later he contrasts the feeling in the States towards

England and France, exhorting his country to make itself better known in America as, he says, England has been careful to do. He concludes with a discussion of the French debt, and why America has not annulled it. There is much shrewd criticism in the book; among others, Mr. H. G. Wells comes in for many hard knocks.

#### LITERARY.

Added to the interesting series of Oxford Books of Verse is **The Oxford Book of Mediæval Latin Verse**, by Stephen Gaselee (Clarendon Press: 8s. 6d.). The selection goes back a long way, beginning with St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, and Prudentius, who would scarcely be called mediæval. Naturally enough the great hymns of the liturgy predominate throughout, but many will be glad to have them here in their more perfect originals, rather than in the renaissance forms which have found their way into our breviaries and missals. Many, too, will be interested in the names of the authors to whom these hymns are attributed; the editor gives the evidence in the notes, but is more positive than critical. More, we think, as curiosities than for their intrinsic worth, secular poems have been set alongside of the religious. Of these some may claim a place merely because they may be said to be "characteristic"; one at least is included for no reason at all that we can see. But on the whole the selection is distinctly representative; not the best, as the editor acknowledges, but full of life and colour, and showing the high standard of those times. The introduction and the notes are excellent.

#### BIOGRAPHICAL.

A life of incredible toil and hardship during forty years as a missionary priest sums up the career of Father Francis Tarin, S.J., an Andalusian apostle who died in 1910. His story, told in French by a brother Jesuit, Father Jean Dissard, and translated by Miss K. Henvey—**Father Francis Tarin, S.J.** (Sheed and Ward: 3s. 6d. n.)—reveals not only absolute self-devotion to the work of saving souls but an emotional fervour, both in the preacher and his audiences, wholly strange to these northern lands. *Foris pugnae: intus timores*—the Pauline phrase comes instinctively to the mind in reading these stirring pages. Father Tarin's Cause of Beatification was introduced at Seville in 1924.

If the Chinese are to be converted to the faith of Christ, the selfish exploitation of their country by foreign nations, each striving to circumvent the other in securing private commercial advantages, must cease, for unfortunately the Catholic religion, although it repudiates nationalist labels, has come to be identified with one or other of the invading forces. However, lives led by such as **The Heroine of Pe-Tang** (B.O. and W.: 6s.)—recorded by Abbé Henry Mazeau, translated by B. Wolferstan, S.J.—a Sister of St. Vincent de Paul, who passed the major portion of her forty-seven years in religion as a missionary in China, will do much to counteract the evil influence of the traders. Sister de Jourias belonged to a noble French family. Born in 1824 she entered religion in 1844 and went to China in 1855. Here she lived and laboured till the Boxer Rising in 1900, which destroyed the material part of her work and, indirectly at least, caused her death. Abbé Mazeau, whose book has been "crowned" by the French Academy, describes her career with great appreciation, largely from her own letters

which give a vivid picture of the TaiPing Rebellion and other Chinese troubles, and of the magnificent work done by the Religious; in peace and in war. The siege and defence of Pe-Tang recalls the heroic endurance of Lucknow.

There is much acute psychology, added to scholarship, in *Saint Francois de Sales: Docteur de la Perfection*, by Abbé Jacques Leclercq (Beauchesne: 12 fr.). The Abbé frankly confesses, and more than once, that he has no use for those lives of saints which eliminate the man; that we must know the man if we would know the saint. In this study he gives us little of the life of Francis; only enough to let us see how much he owed to a happy home and congenial surroundings, how much to the peaceful conditions under which he laboured as Bishop. He is more concerned to show us to what an extent he was a child of his age; caught by its turn for psychological analysis, loving practical works rather than speculation, hopeful of all men, even the most sinful. He puts the saint before men in their own streets and houses, explaining to them how sanctity is at their own door if they will have it. In the second part the author deals with the teaching of St. Francis to his Visitation Nuns, giving some main points, chiefly in the saint's own words. It is a very interesting study: some by reading it may find their views of St. Francis modified; everyone will see how he was a man among men.

Three more volumes on the Little Flower have come to us to be noticed. The first *St. Thérèse de l'Enfant Jésus*, by Mgr. Laveille, translated by the Rev. M. Fitzsimons, O.M.I. (B.O. & W.: 6s.), is published as the "definitive biography." At all events the author has had access to more unpublished documents than any other author, including private letters of the Martin family, and writes with the express approval of the sisters of the saint. This life throws much light on the early days of St. Thérèse; it also does not minimize the sufferings in the convent, though it gives them a somewhat different colour than that given by Laudet. But, for a "definitive biography," the saint's own story still seems to hold the field.

In *Sermons on St. Thérèse of the Child Jesus*, by Father Francis Xavier of St. Teresa, O.D.C., Vice-Postulator of the Cause of the Servants of God of the Order of Discalced Carmelites, translated from the Italian by a Religious of the Society of the Holy Child Jesus (B.O. & W.: 3s.), we have given to us her Mission, her Greatness, her Secret, her Apostolate, her Merit, in that charming manner of declaration and apostrophe so dear to the Italian preacher. To say that the matter is not new, is no disparagement to the book; there may be in some a tendency to find too much that is new in this simplest of saints. The translator has done her work faithfully.

It is scarcely a year since we commended Father Benedict Williamson's *The Sure Way of St. Thérèse of Lisieux* (Kegan Paul: 10s. 6d.), and already we have received a second and revised edition. To this second edition there is added an epilogue on the saint's attitude to suffering, which enhances the value of a work whose worth is sufficiently proved by the welcome it has received.

The Sisters of Notre Dame continue their admirable series of popular lives of the saints. The latest, *St. Wilfrid* (Sands and Co.), is quite worthy of its predecessors. We are given the making of the saint, in

Iona and Rome; then a good account of the state of the Church in England when he was made a bishop. The controversies of the time are well described; also the adversities of Wilfrid which helped more than all else to his sanctity. The Life is smoothly written, well produced, with several original illustrations.

Also from the same Sisters of Notre Dame, though not in the same series, comes a **Life of St. Alphonsus Liguori** (B.O. & W.: 4s. 6d.). The material for such a Life is so abundant that the author must have found great difficulty in keeping within the limits of a shorter book, such as the ordinary reader would welcome. She has done her work well; one cannot read this Life without knowing the saint better, nor without being led through him to a greater love of Jesus and Mary.

It is much to be regretted that when foreign publishers think it well to publish a book in English they do not always provide that the English version is well done. Nor, if the English is tolerable, do they always take much care about printer's errors. These two complaints we have to make about a book which, otherwise, we would have strongly recommended to our readers,—**The Life of the Servant of God Pius X.**, by Abbot Benedetto Pierami, with a Preface by Baron Ludwig de (sic) Pastor (Marietti, Turin: 3s. and 4s.). The book is written "under the auspices of" the Postulator General of the Cause, or rather it would seem by the Postulator General himself. It is the result of a most exhaustive enquiry, going down to details of every day, made by the author as a preparation for his work. This at least may be said; that no future Life will be able to be written of Pope Pius X. without taking account of what has been collected here. At the end are described some of the miracles attributed to the Holy Father both before and after his death.

While reading Bishop Knox's contribution to the Bunyan tercentenary, **John Bunyan in Relation to His Times** (Longmans: 3s. 6d.), one is tempted to think that the author had in mind rather our own times than the times of Bunyan, and that he has chosen his material accordingly. Certainly he has not scrupled to use both Bunyan and his times as a kind of clothes-line on which to peg his own opinions, both of his own Church and its present difficulties, and of others. There is much learning shown in the chapters; the opinions and statements will be judged according to different standards. For instance, speaking of the time of Elizabeth he says: "The newly formed Order of Jesuits did not scruple to murder heretical sovereigns." There are some lies which seem to be as immortal as their father. We had hitherto thought better of Bishop Knox than he now allows us to think.

#### HOMILETIC.

Among really useful works to assist the preacher we can strongly recommend **The Advent Epistles and Gospels Homiletically Explained**, by Bishop von Keppler of Rottenburg, translated by the Rev. Hamilton Macdonald, M.A. (Sands: 6s. n.). The Bishop makes a strong appeal for the return of the homily to the pulpit, urging that in this more than in any other kind of preaching is the duty of the pastor fulfilled; its having been crushed out by attempts to deal with modern subjects is, for our faithful, a loss rather than a gain. But that the homily may be successful it must not be in the air; it must be founded on solid

knowledge. To meet this need the Bishop has given the student in this volume 1) an examination of the liturgy on each Sunday in Advent, 2) a long and careful analysis of the Gospel, 3) the same of the Epistle, 4) outline-sketches to enable the preacher to treat the material in different ways. There is matter for many sermons and addresses. The translation is well done. A Preface by His Eminence Cardinal Bourne dwells eloquently on the influence of Christianity in the world.

## FICTION.

As a student well-versed in Egyptian lore, Miss Leonora Eyles has one prerequisite for writing a successful romance—*Shepherd of Israel* (Constable: 7s. 6d. n.)—with the great figure of Moses as central figure. But she is handicapped by a total disbelief in God's revelation, which forces her to distort beyond recognition the fine dramatic Bible story. She has had to explain away all miracles—the manna, for instance, becomes a sudden growth of mushrooms and the water from the Rock is discovered by a divining rod!—and get rid of the supernatural element altogether. The Ten Commandments are framed as the result of Moses' reflections upon his own experience amongst men. The great prophet himself becomes a hesitating pragmatist, feeling his way to a dubious goal. Thus, the book, ably-written though it is, has its chief value in showing the wholly-destructive effects of ultra-modernism.

Most of the attractive characters who figured in Father Heagney's former book—*Ted Bascomb in the Cow Country*—reappear in a sort of sequel with another hero, *The Testing of Al. Bascomb* (Benziger Bros.: \$1.25), by the same competent author, who has evidently first-hand acquaintance with the cowboys and farmers, as well as the fauna and flora, of the West. A particularly fine specimen of the former, a huge panther, provides most of the thrills in the book and adds attraction to the cover.

Mr. Myles Connolly, an American writer of fiction, has composed an exquisite fantasy in *Mr. Blue* (B.O. and W.: 5s. n.), a Chestertonian conception whose God-based optimism is such that no vicissitudes of fortune or circumstance can abate it. Possessed of a colossal fortune, reduced to beggary, with no home or relatives or employment, he sees in everything a spiritual source of joy and finds happiness in making others happy. High imaginations, true moral judgments, an unconquerable faith, these are all exhibited in word and incident, but the sketch in sum is somewhat vague and inconsistent. No ascetic such as Mr. Blue is supposed to be in substance, would surround himself in wasteful luxury when he had money to spend. He would regard himself merely as its trustee.

## NON-CATHOLIC.

Though the Bishop of Pretoria, Dr. Neville S. Talbot, D.D., M.C., dedicates his book, *The Riddle of Life* (Longmans: 2s. 6d.), "to the memory of Friedrich von Hügel, Prophet and Saint of God," and though his quotations from the Baron's writings are copious throughout, we are not sure that the latter would have endorsed all the author's conclusions. He makes no scruple about painting in the darkest colours he can, borrowed chiefly from the writings of others, the miseries of human life, and then asks himself what explanation there can be to reconcile it all with the fact of an all-loving God. The origin of it he gives up;

the final solution is also lost in mystery; but there is light in the darkness from the fact of human heroism, which nothing but suffering could prove, in the everlasting hope which rings through the Old Testament, in the Man of Sorrows, who embraced it all and made it a condition of His Resurrection. With all this the Baron, no doubt, would have agreed; would he have agreed with the author's looking at the sufferings of life as intrinsically evil in themselves? He would, we think, have said that if man alone were the measure the statement might pass; but man is made for God, and on that plane even suffering may be found to be no less a gift of God than pleasure.

A little book of addresses **Concerning the Inner Life**, by Miss Evelyn Underhill (Methuen: 2s.), drives home on every page the need of the life of prayer for anyone at all who would do good work among men. It will not have the internal and external separate; it will not allow that we should first pray and then work; it insists that the one must inspire the other, so that work becomes, not another thing, but prayer in action. It leads to God within us; and thinking with God we work with God, which gives a man the best he can receive, and enables him to give his best in return. It is a little book of much practical wisdom.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

When we read certain works of Experimental Psychology, as when we read certain works on the Philosophy of Mysticism, we are continually obsessed with the sensation of being cramped within a narrow space too small to allow of any comfort. Thus in reading **The Child's Religion, A Study of the Development of the Religious Sentiment**, by Pierre Bavet, translated by George H. Green (Dent and Sons: 6s.), we feel ourselves questioning at every step the limits which the author sets to all his definitions and ideas. The Child, Religion, the Religious Sentiment, Love, Adoration, all seem to us to be much "bigger" things than the author allows or assumes; and when he comes to see no difference between love and its corruption we are rendered desperate. The dangers of all Experimental Psychology are mainly two. The first is the inclination to judge of the normal by the abnormal, to make universal laws from peculiar cases; the second is to form a theory beforehand, and to interpret one's experiments so as to confirm it. It seems to us that this book does not avoid either of these dangers. To a Catholic teacher of a child, a child's religion is very much more than that which is here analysed.

It was a happy idea of the Catholic weekly *America* to solicit from living novelists of eminence their views on the novel, and to print them in a series of articles. It was a happier idea to collect that score or so of opinions and publish them with an appropriate introduction in a book, **Fiction and its Makers** (The America Press: \$2.00). Father Talbot, who edits and introduces the volume, makes plain what some of the actual contributors in practice do not seem to realize, that no good Catholic should write a novel in which the Catholic Faith and moral code are not taken as indisputably true, and therefore never for a moment treated as doubtful. The great majority of those who write here happily act on this assumption, and it is interesting to read how their art benefits by this strict and extended guidance.

We have received from Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne a large and handsome portrait group of **English Martyrs**. Anything that

may help us in our devotion to these great servants of God is welcome,—especially just now when we are looking forward to the early canonization of some of them, and when the cause of the beatification of others to the number of two hundred and fifty odd is actually in the hands of the Sacred Congregation at Rome. But it is a pity that the title is not more explicit. This group is not representative of the "English Martyrs" as a whole. None of those who suffered after 1583 is here; none of the 252 Venerables; not even those Beati, who, like B. Adrian Fortescue and the three Benedictine Abbots of 1539, were omitted from the first decree of 1886. The explanation, of course, is that the present portrait is only a reproduction of that first issued by Messrs. Barraud in 1887 or thereabouts. But it would have saved disappointment to state this.

## MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The most timely of recent C.T.S. twopenny pamphlets is that entitled *How the "Roman Question" was settled: explained by the Pope himself*—a translation of two addresses by His Holiness in which he gives what must be reckoned the authentic account of his aims and motives in effecting the Settlement. It is an account which should be circulated as widely as possible.

The lecture on *Catholic Emancipation* given by Mgr. Canon Howlett at the Coliseum on February 10th has been published at 4d. by Messrs. Sands. The speaker's complaint that H.M. the King, alone of his subjects, was not emancipated, *i.e.*, free without resigning his Kingship to follow his conscience, was controverted in the Press, but seems to us valid in the sense that there is nothing in the English monarchy that necessitates the profession of Protestantism.

The story of *Mother Margaret Clement (1540—1612)*, which is a new C.T.S. pamphlet, is doubly interesting for the holy Canoness of St. Augustine was a connection of Blessed Thomas More's and the Order she belonged to has a house at Newton Abbot in Devon, the connection of which with the Continental foundations is sketched.

Amongst the flood of pre-election literature may be noted a sixpenny pamphlet called *Liberal Temperance Policy* (British Periodicals Ltd.) which looks both before and after, and gives a useful conspectus of the present position of the Liquor Question. We find no mention anywhere of the crucial point of every Local Option scheme—the size of the majority required to carry total Prohibition.

Marietti of Turin publish at 2.00 lire a *Via Crucis* in Latin, the devotions of which are drawn from Scripture, the Fathers and the Liturgies by a Benedictine Monk.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

BEAUCHESNE, Paris.

*De Sanctissima Eucharistia.* By Adhémar d'Alès. Pp. xv. 176.

BENZIGER BROS., New York.

*Social Problems and Agencies.* By H. S. Spalding. New Edit. Pp. xxii. 590. Price, \$2.50. *The Testing of Al Bascomb.* By the Rev. H. J. Heagney. Pp. 164. Price, \$1.25.

BERNARD GRASSET, Paris.

*Le Carmel.* By M. M. Vaussard. Pp. 258. Price, 12.00 fr.

BRITISH PERIODICALS, London.

*Liberal Temperance Policy.* Pp. 102. Price, 6d. n.

BROWNE AND NOLAN, Dublin.

*A Compendium of Catechetical Instruction.* Edited by Mgr. John Hagan. Four Vols. Pp. lxxix. 471: xi. 536: xi. 573: xi. 548.

Price 15s. each or 52s. 6d. the set.

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE, London.

*Minor Works of Walter Hilton.* Edited by Dorothy Jones. Pp. lxvii. 232. Price, 5s. and 7s. 6d. *Novissima Verba of St. Thérèse.* Pp. x. 218. Price, 2s. *A Retreat under the Guidance of St. Teresa.* Edited by Mother Mary of the B.S. Pp. xxviii. 316. Price, 7s. 6d. *The Sacramentary.* By Abbot Ildefonso Schuster. Vol. IV. Pp. xii. 456. Price, 15s. *Mr. Blue.* By Myles Connolly. Pp. viii. 152. Price, 5s. n.

CASSELL AND CO., London.

*Capitalism and Morality.* By L. Watt, S.J. Pp. ix. 150. Price, 3s. 6d. n.

CATHOLIC FOREIGN MISSIONARY SOCIETY OF AMERICA, Maryknoll.

*A Modern Martyr.* Edited by J. A. Walsh, M.A. Pp. 238. Price, \$1.00.

C.T.S., London.

*Many Twopenny Pamphlets and Reprints.*

CONSTABLE, London.

*Shepherd of Israel.* By Leonora Ayles. Pp. 310. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

DESCLEE DE BROUWER ET CIE., Paris.

*L'Âme Ardente de Saint Jean de la Croix.* By Abbé R. Hoor-naert. Pp. 136. Price, 7.00 fr.

HEATH CRANTON, London.

*Adventures in Literature.* By J. C. Wordsworth, M.A. Pp. 293. Price, 12s. 6d. n.

HERDER, London.

*The School of Suffering.* By Bishop von Keppler. Translated by A. F. Brockland. Pp. v. 188. Price, 5s. n. *Progressive Scholasticism.* From the Italian of G. Bruni, Ph.D. By J. S. Zybura, Ph.D. Pp. xxxviii. 185. Price, 6s. n. *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius.* From the Spanish by a Benedictine of Stanbrook. Pp. xii. 163. Price, 6s. n. *The Prayer of Faith.* By Rev. M. A. Chapman. Pp. ix. 311. Price, 7s. n. *St. Joseph's Month.* By Sister Mary Emmanuel, O.S.B. Pp. ix. 253. Price, 7s. n. *Our Lady's Titles.* By Rev. A. Power, S.J. Pp. ix. 214. Price 7s. n.

KEGAN PAUL, London.

*The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages.* By Mgr. H. K. Mann, D.D. Vol XV. Pp. viii. 513. Price, 15s. n.

LONGMANS, London.

*A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation.* By Denis Gwynn. Pp. xxxi. 294. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *Catholic Emancipation.* A volume of essays by various writers. Pp. ix. 281. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *The Historical Character of St. John's Gospel.* By J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. Pp. 115. Price, 3s. 6d. n.

MARII E MARIETTI, Turin.

*Theologia Moralis Universa.* By Rev. C. Colli-Lanzi. Vol III. IV. Pp. 371, 624. Price, 40.00 l. *Exercitia Spiritualia S. Ignatii.* Spanish text and Latin Version (Roothan). Pp. xx. 356. Price, 6.00 l. *Via Crucis* (pamphlet). Price, 2.00 l. *Commentarium D. Thomae in Aristoteli Libros.* Edited by P. A. M. Pirotta, O.P. Pp. 160. Price, 12.00 l.

ROUTLEDGE AND SONS, London.

*The Dialogue on Miracles of Cæsarius of Heisterbach.* Translated by H. Scott and C. C. S. Bland. 2 Vols. Pp. xix. 546, 374. Price, 36s. n.

ST. DOMINIC'S PRESS, Ditchling.

*St. Dominic.* By Hilary Pepler. Pp. ix. 61. Price, 2s. 6d. *Pilate: a Passion Play.* Pp. 47. Price, 1s. 6d.

SANDS AND CO., London.

*Catholic Emancipation* (pamphlet). By Mgr. Canon Howlett. Price, 4d.

SHEED AND WARD, London.

*The Wounded World.* By C. C. Martindale, S.J. Pp. 95. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Mystical Prayer according to St. Jane de Chantal: Mystical Prayer according to St. Francis de Sales.* Both translated by A. E. Swinstead from the French of Abbé A. Saudeau. Pp. 92 and 57. Price (each), 2s. 6d. n. *The Secret of the Carré d'Ans.* By H. Ghéon. Translated by F. J. Sheed. Pp. 217. Price, 7s. 6d.

S.P.C.K., London.

*Ramon Lull.* By E. Allison Peers, M.A. Pp. xviii. 454. Price, 18s. *English Ecclesiastical Studies.* By Rose Graham, M.A. Pp. xiii. 463. Price, 15s. n.

TYPOGRAPHIA ARCHIEPISCOPALIS, Zagreb.

*Sententia Aristoteli de compositione corporum.* By Dr. Francis Sanc, S.J. Pp. vi. 117.

WOODGRANGE PRESS, London.

*Road Rhymes.* By M. Michael. Pp. 66. Price, 2s. 6d. n.

